

abroad and at the same time would discourage wage cutting as a means of selling more goods in this market because it would not expand sales beyond the limit set or that could be set under the law.

I make the plea that this bill be given hearings by the Committee on Ways and Means at an early date. The time has come when we can no longer rely on the present legislation as it is administered to do what is necessary for many industries and lines of agriculture in this country. It is as much in the interest of the workers in these industries as to the plant owners to hold a fair share of our own market under conditions of fair competition. The bill that I have introduced is designed to make this possible. I urge that way be made for its consideration on the floor during this session.

Our First Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 5, 1957

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, this day is memorable in the history of our country not only because the President addressed the 85th Congress in joint session prior to delivering his message on the state of the Union but for another reason also.

On January 5, 1777—180 years ago—Benjamin Franklin arrived in Paris on an important diplomatic mission in behalf of the American Colonies, which were then fighting for their independence. Franklin was 71 years of age and was numbered among the most renowned Americans. His experiments in electricity and his earlier activity as a diplomatic representative from Pennsylvania to England had brought him great recognition in Europe.

The French aristocracy got an excellent impression of Franklin, and he was well received everywhere. His mission was a complete success. He won French support for the American struggle for independence. An alliance was established which resulted in military help for the Colonies both on land and sea.

Benjamin Franklin remained in France until a year following the signing of the treaty which ended the Revolutionary War. In accordance with Franklin's desire, Thomas Jefferson was nominated to succeed him as Ambassador to France.

Mr. Speaker, this brief statement about Benjamin Franklin is a free translation of an editorial which appeared in Decorah Posten under date of January 3, 1957. That newspaper is printed in the Norwegian language and has a wider circulation than any other newspaper of its kind in the United States. The editorial staff of Decorah Posten deserves praise for consistent scholarly work and for giving appropriate recognition to notable men and events—of which the editorial referred to is a sample.

This Nation Under God and Christ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 5, 1957

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this great legislative body a resolution seeking to add amendment 23 to our present United States Constitution to the end that the basic and fundamental law of our land might recognize the Master Architect, Creator, and Builder of the Universe, the Almighty God, who hung out the stars and lit the burning taper of the sun and draped the glorious rainbow as a scarf about the

shoulders of the storm; and also to the further end that there may be recognized in that same Constitution Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Universal Saviour of all mankind. Many people, I believe, think the greatest deficiency of our present Constitution lies in its failure to recognize specifically God Almighty and America's definite position as a great Christian nation. In this modern day of paganistic and mundane attitudes, when communism and all of its philosophy of atheism and statism and materialism hold full sway in many places of the earth and embrace millions of its peoples, there is surely a great need for America to assert humbly her unalterable dependence upon God and her own daily fellowship of Christianity as the prevailing ideology of most of her people. As most everyone knows, the Constitution is whatever the people decree it shall be, and since most of the American people are God fearing and Christ following, the Constitution itself should make manifestation accordingly.

This proposed amendment is in no way any encroachment upon the demarcation line of church-state separation that has always characterized our Government, since this amendment would neither recognize nor support with tax revenue any church organization whatsoever. While this amendment would not in anywise establish a church, yet it would in a positive way recognize the authorship and authorityship of the Supreme Being and His Son, Jesus Christ, as the Saviour of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, the Holy Bible tells us:

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.

And the great Apostle Paul once wrote:

For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

I hope our great Constitution may come to recognize God as our Lord and may also come to recognize that the Nation's foundation must be laid upon Jesus Christ as the firm Rock of Ages and Saviour of the world.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, from the limitations of our partial knowledge we turn in our deep need to Thee, whose dwelling place is light, without the shadow of earth-born clouds. Save us from trying to live our lives as if we had to live them by ourselves. The mystery of prayer, where spirit with spirit may meet, brings to us the stupendous fact that we are not alone—that another stands always beside us and our humanity—that other of

whom we say with utter confidence, "This is my Father's world." Bewildered, uncertain, and fearful as we are, we are Thy children, and we cannot drift beyond the circle of Thy love. So we come with yearning words upon our lips, "Our Father, hallowed be Thy name." As in these fateful days our frail hands have a part in the shaping of the world that is to be as a fit habitation for us and all Thy other children, give us the vision, the wisdom, and the courage which will make for both justice and lasting peace. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 5, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY, under authority of the order of July 27, 1956, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted on December 10, 1956, a report (No. 2831) entitled "Development of Upper Columbia River Basin, Canada and the United States," which was printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, under authority of the order of July 27, 1956, submitted, on December 31, 1956, a report (No. 2832) on Communist Interrogation, Indoctrination, and Exploitation of American Military and Civilian Prisoners; which was printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 40) providing for a joint session of the Congress on Thursday, January 10, 1957, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

JOINT SESSION OF TWO HOUSES ON THURSDAY NEXT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a House concurrent resolution, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 40), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 10, 1957, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT MEETING OF ARMED SERVICES AND FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEES TO HOLD HEARINGS ON THE PRESIDENT'S NEAR EAST PROPOSAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee be given permission to sit jointly for the purpose of holding hearings on the President's Near East proposal, presented to Congress on last Saturday. I further ask unanimous consent that when these two committees sit jointly for that purpose, they be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, there will be a morning hour for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, the submission of other resolutions, and the presentation of petitions and memorials, but only for the transaction of routine business; and in connection therewith I ask unanimous consent that any statements be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received by the Secretary of the Senate

September 24, 1956, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 10th semiannual report on the operations of the mutual-security program, for the period January 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956.

The accomplishments during this 6-month period under this program of mutual effort have further advanced the security, the economic progress and the well-being of the United States and our partners in the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The WHITE HOUSE, September 20, 1956.

ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received in the office of the Vice President on October 15, 1956, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, October 15, 1956.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 143 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, provides for a suspension of assistance to Yugoslavia as therein specified unless I find and report to the Congress with my reasons therefor: (1) That there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union; (2) that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for the Communist conquest of the world; and (3) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act.

After careful study and examination of all the relevant facts available to me I hereby find and report to the Congress affirmatively with respect to the three matters above mentioned.

My reasons therefor are the following:

1. The policy of assisting Yugoslavia was begun by this Government in 1949. That policy was not based upon approval of, or affinity with, the internal policies of the Government of Yugoslavia. It was undertaken because, despite such internal policies, it was then deemed in the interests of the United States to support the independence of Yugoslavia against a major effort by the Soviet Union to dominate that country. The balance of available evidence leads me to find that Yugoslavia remains independent of control by the Soviet Union and desires to continue to be independent; that it is still subject to efforts by the Soviet Union to compromise that independence; and that some assistance from the United States continues to be required and is desired by the Government of Yugoslavia to assure the maintenance of its independence.

I am aware of the fact that the designs of the Soviet Union against Yugoslavia are more subtle than heretofore, and that perhaps those designs are not adequately appreciated, or defended against, by Yugoslavia. Nevertheless there remain the basic factors, that is, the independence of Yugoslavia; the dedication of Yugoslavia to its independence; and the Soviet endangering of that independence.

2. My finding that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for Communist conquest of the world is based upon the fact that the ideology and doctrine of the Yugoslav Communist Party appear to adhere to the concept that each nation should determine for itself which kind of a society it wishes and that there should be no interference by one nation in the internal affairs of another.

3. My reason for finding that it is in the interests of the national security of the United States to continue to furnish at least limited assistance to Yugoslavia is that otherwise, in my opinion, there is a danger that Yugoslavia will be unable to maintain its independence. I believe, moreover, that the United States policies inaugurated in 1949 to enable Yugoslavia to maintain its independence remain valid.

This determination on my part meets the statutory requirement in section 143 regarding the utilization of the public funds allotted to Yugoslavia under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and under prior mutual security legislation. Its primary immediate effect will be to clear the way for conversations with appropriate Yugoslav officials to examine the various possibilities for bilateral cooperation in the economic field thus made feasible under our laws. In the military field, the various departments of the Government have, since the enactment of section 143 in July of this year, at my direction, followed a policy of permitting only small, routine, and long-planned deliveries of equipment. I intend that this attitude, which implies the nondelivery of jet planes and other items of heavy equipment, shall be maintained until the situation can be more accurately appraised during the days to come. I believe, however, that economic aid for the people of Yugoslavia, primarily in the form of foodstuffs, may now prudently and wisely be proceeded with.

In any case, I shall not consider that my action herewith definitely settles the various questions pertaining to United States-Yugoslav relations. These problems will, on the contrary, remain under my constant review, and I have, in addition, directed that those officers who conduct our day-to-day relations with Yugoslavia vigilantly apply the very helpful criteria established by the Congress in section 143 to insure that the decision which I have now made remains justified in future circumstances. I have made it clear, furthermore, that my determination is not, even in economic matters, to be taken as a continuing directive necessitating the obligation or expenditure of the funds available for Yugoslavia, regardless of circumstances,

but is one which restores discretion in this area to me and my subordinates to take such actions as accord with the applicable national policy relating to Yugoslavia and serve the national interest. Such an approach will, I am sure, serve the foreign policy interests of our country and, at the same time, afford adequate protection against the unwise expenditure of public funds.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF PEANUT STATISTICS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act of June 24, 1936, as amended, (relating to the collection and publication of peanut statistics) to delete the requirement for reports from persons owning or operating peanut picking or threshing machines, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING OF FOODSTUFFS AND OTHER AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on strategic stockpiling of foodstuffs and other agricultural products (A) inside the United States and (B) outside the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposition of surplus commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON DESIRABILITY OF A FOOD-STAMP PLAN

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the desirability of a food-stamp plan or similar program for distribution through States (including the District of Columbia, the Territories, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) and local units of government of future surplus production to needy persons in the United States, its Territories, and possessions (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposition of agricultural products by the Commodity Credit Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Three letters from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there were no significant developments to report for the months of June, July, and September 1956 relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico in the

control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Three letters from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there were no significant developments to report for the months of August, October, and November 1956 relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting pursuant to law, a report of that Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 3)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, President, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS ON VIOLATIONS REGARDING THE OVER-OBLIGATION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation for the installation of automatic telephone equipment at an overseas post (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 144 reports on violations relating to the overobligation of appropriations in the Department of Defense (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of appropriations in regional offices of the Forest Service, in region 1 at Missoula, Mont., and region 5, at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in the United States Coast Guard (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Two letters from the Deputy Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of appropriations for "Operations, 1956" which occurred in the offices of the Regional Director, New York, N. Y., and the Regional Director, Philadelphia, Pa., respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, six violations regarding the overobligation of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

Three letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President,

transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the reapportionment of the following appropriations for the fiscal year 1957, for the Indian Claims Commission for "Salaries and expenses;" the Department of State, for "Salaries and expenses," and the Veterans' Administration for "Readjustment benefits" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Justice Department for fees and expenses of witnesses, for the fiscal year 1957, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Eleven letters from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to the reapportionment of certain appropriations in the following departments and agencies, for the fiscal year 1957, which indicate the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations:

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-age and Survivors Insurance";

Treasury Department, for "Administering the public debt, Bureau of the Public Debt"; Treasury Department, for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Treasurer";

Department of Agriculture, for "Salaries and expenses, Forest Service";

United States Tariff Commission, for "Salaries and expenses";

National Mediation Board, for "Salaries and expenses";

United States Civil Service Commission, for "Annuities, Panama Canal Construction Employees and Lighthouse Service Widows";

Railroad Retirement Board, for "Salaries and expenses";

Commodity Credit Corporation, for administrative expenses authorization;

Department of Defense, for "Maintenance and Operations, Army," "Medical Care, Navy," "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force," and "Hospitals and Medical Care, Public Health Service"; and

Department of Agriculture, for "Salaries and expenses, Forest Service."

LUMP-SUM APPROPRIATION FOR CREDITING POSTAL REVENUES

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, requesting a lump-sum appropriation in the amount of \$2,081,000 be made to the Post Office Department for crediting postal revenues, for the fiscal year 1957, relating to franked mail by Members of Congress and others, and penalty mail of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 4)

A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by that court, for the year ended September 29, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his semiannual report, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his semiannual report, together with the semiannual reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955 (with an accompany-

ing report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CARE AND MAINTENANCE OF SURRENDER TREE SITE, SANTIAGO, CUBA

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to fix responsibility in the American Battle Monuments Commission for the care and maintenance of the Surrender Tree Site in Santiago, Cuba (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMANDANT OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S SCHOOL TO AWARD DEGREES AND CREDITS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commandant of The Judge Advocate General's School to award appropriate degrees and credits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CHIEF OF ENGINEERS TO PUBLISH INFORMATION PAMPHLETS, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Chief of Engineers to publish information pamphlets, maps, brochures, and other material (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT CHAPLAIN, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment of an Assistant Chaplain at the United States Military Academy, to fix the compensation of civilian clergymen appointed as Chaplain and Assistant Chaplain thereof, and for certain other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

IMPROVEMENT OF CAREER OPPORTUNITIES OF NURSES AND MEDICAL SPECIALISTS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEFINITION OF CERTAIN SERVICE AS ACTIVE MILITARY SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS FOR PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT TO MILITARY AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the number of cadets that the President may personally select for appointment to the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND THE ARMY GENERAL STAFF

Two letters from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, as of June 30, 1956, and September 30,

1956 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts, in excess of \$50,000 for research, development, and experimental purposes awarded by the Department of the Navy, for the period January 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AVERAGE MONTHLY FLIGHT PAY TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the number of certain officers in the Coast Guard and the average monthly flight pay paid to such officers, for the 6-month period ended December 26, 1956; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON HELIUM PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, transactions under the helium production fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, for the period January 1, to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that System as of June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development contracts of that Department, for the period January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, National Security Training Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated September 14, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on Federal contributions under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, for the quarters ended June 30, 1956, and September 30, 1956, respectively (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by the Federal Civil Defense Administration, for the quarters

ended June 30, 1956, and September 30, 1956; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ABACA FIBER OPERATIONS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report by the Administration on Abaca Fiber Operations, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ENTITLED "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION REPORT," DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of that Department entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period January 1 to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF AIR FORCE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1957, September 30, 1956, there was an aggregate of 2,759 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE FLYING PAY

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the United States Air Force flying pay, for the period March 1, through August 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the contracts negotiated by that Committee, during the period January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STUDY OF PROBLEMS RAISED BY GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on a preliminary study of the problems raised by Government-sponsored research and development programs in industry, dated November 9, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF TAX AMORTIZATION PROGRAM IN NITROGEN INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report concerning the results of a survey of the effects of the tax amortization program on competition and small-business participation in the nitrogen industry (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INTERIM REPORT ON NICKEL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report regarding the special investigation and study of the production, allocation, distribution, and use of nickel (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INTERIM REPORT ON SURVEY OF IRON AND STEEL SCRAP

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report on a survey of iron and steel scrap available and potentially available

(with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF NICKEL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the supply and distribution of nickel, dated December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 36th quarterly report on Export Control, for the 2d and 3d quarters of 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a quarterly report on the progress of liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as of September 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work, for the period of July and August 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military price contracts with business firms for work in the United States, net value of all procurement actions with small business and other firms, for the periods July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956, and July 1, 1955, to May 31, 1956 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States, net value of procurement actions with industrial and commercial firms and educational and non-profit institutions, for the period July-September 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States, net value of procurement actions with industrial and commercial firms and educational and nonprofit institutions, for the month of July 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Corporation, for the calendar year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of that Administration, for the period January 1-June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth semiannual report of that Administration, covering operations between January 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON VOLUNTARY HOME MORTGAGE CREDIT PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second annual report on the voluntary home-mortgage credit program, covering the activities of the National Voluntary Mortgage Credit Extension Committee and its regional subcommittees for the period August 2, 1954, to March 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON TIN OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Corporation on tin operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on borrowing authority for the quarter ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Bank covering the period January-June 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Director, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing lands acquired by that Commission for the development of the park, parkway, and playground system, during the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency,

Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency for the year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CONFERENCE OF STATE SOCIETIES

A letter from the former president of the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Conference for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION—TAX AMORTIZATION WRITEOFF

A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report of that committee relating to tax amortization writeoff (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

IMPORTS OF DISTILLED SPIRITS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, reporting for the information of the Senate, that effective November 12, 1956, all quantitative restrictions have been abolished on imports of whisky into the United Kingdom from the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON DISTILLED SPIRITS (S. Doc. No. 5)

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 314, 84th Congress, a report on distilled spirits (whisky), dated December 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW POLICY RELATING TO ISSUANCE OF TAX CERTIFICATES

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a public notice of that Commission, issued September 27, 1956, relating to a change of policy applying to transactions based on contracts entered into after October 15, 1956 (with an accompanying notice); to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of the American Legion, dated October 31, 1956 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Finance.

IMPLEMENTATION OF CONVENTION WITH NORWAY

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the convention between the United States of America and Norway, entered into force on November 9, 1948, relating to the disposition of the claim against the United States asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES WITH FINLAND

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a special report on educational exchanges with Finland entitled "An Investment in Understanding: Educational Exchange Program Between the United States and Finland, 1950-54" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISARMAMENT—COMMUNICATION FROM THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U. S. S. R.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a communication from the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., dated July 27, 1955, relating to disarmament (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF EAST-WEST TRADE IN 1955

A letter from the Deputy Director for Mutual Defense Assistance Control, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth semiannual report entitled "Survey of East-West Trade in 1955" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth semiannual report of that Commission, for the period ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, on the educational exchange activities conducted during the period January 1-June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISTRIBUTION OF NOBEL PEACE PRIZE OF 1957

A letter from the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, signed by A. Schon, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a circular regarding the distribution of the Nobel peace prize of 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DISTRIBUTION AND DISPOSAL OF REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY TO EDUCATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal property made available for distribution to and real property disposed of to educational and public health institutions, for the period April 1 through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Department of State under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, for the period July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the disposition of foreign excess property, in the Department of Defense, for the period January 1, to June 30, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for research and development purposes, for the period January 1, through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying re-

port); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, supervised by the Home Loan Bank Board, constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ABACA FIBER PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the abaca fiber program, administered by General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON CENTRAL VALLEY, FOLSOM RESERVOIR, KINGS RIVER, AND ISABELLA RESERVOIR PROJECTS, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Central Valley, Folsom Reservoir, Kings River, and Isabella Reservoir projects in Central Valley Basin, California, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON MISSOURI RIVER BASIN WATER RESOURCES PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Missouri River Basin water resources development program, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON OFFICE OF TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of the Treasurer of the United States, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ARKANSAS, WHITE, AND RED RIVER BASINS POWER SYSTEM AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins power system and related activities, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying

report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR ISRAEL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States Assistance Program for Israel, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, for the fiscal years 1952-1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States Information Agency, for the period August 1, 1953, to June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN LANDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Administration of Indian Lands by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated January 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF INDIVIDUAL MONEYS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Administration of Individual Indian Moneys by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated November 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON COLUMBIA RIVER POWER SYSTEM AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Columbia River Power System and Related Activities, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, INC.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON RENEWAL OF INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report relative to consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, dated September 1, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SAN LUIS UNIT, WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on

the San Luis Unit, West San Joaquin Division, Central Valley project, California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON HILLCREST UNIT, MOUNTAIN HOME DIVISION, SNAKE RIVER PROJECT, IDAHO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Hillcrest Unit, Mountain Home Division, Snake River project, Idaho (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a preliminary report of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, dated July 13, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Secretary of the Interior relating to synthetic liquid fuels, for the calendar year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification had been made of the lands to be benefited by the North Side Pumping Division, Minidoka project, Idaho, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT ON FORD'S THEATER, WASHINGTON, D. C.

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplement to the report on the Ford's Theater, Washington, D. C., which was transmitted to the Senate on July 12, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in Olympic National Park, Washington (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES UNDER THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipts and expenditures under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, for the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a review of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF THE CHOCTAW NATION V. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of the claim of the Choctaw Nation v. The United States of America (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON LICENSED HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF COMMISSARY OPERATIONS, CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual financial report on the commissary and messing facilities activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration outside the continental United States, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CAUSES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THUNDERSTORMS AND OTHER ATMOSPHERIC DISTURBANCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances, dated July 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON WAR-RISK INSURANCE AND MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of that Department in providing war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of that department in providing war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of September 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SEALS FOR BUREAUS AND OFFICES OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 for the period April 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 for the period July 1, 1956, through September 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS, FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Two letters from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting for the information of the Senate copies of recent publications of that Commission entitled "M-46—Major Natural Gas Pipe Lines, June 30, 1956"; "M-47—Principal Electric Utility Generating Stations and Transmission Lines, 1956"; "S-123—Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost" and "Annual Production Expenses, 1955 Supplement" and Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1955 with accompanying publications); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of recent publications of that Commission entitled "Typical Residential Electric Bills, 1956," and "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Publicly Owned, 1954" (with accompanying publications); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 22d annual report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Five letters from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, for the period June 30, 1956, to October 31, 1956 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS EXECUTED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report listing contracts executed by negotiation for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test, for the period January 1, 1956, through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., September 19-20, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, for the calendar year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY NAVAL VESSELS AND CLAIMS FOR TOWAGE OR SALVAGE SERVICES RENDERED TO NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims settled for damage caused by vessels of the Navy and of claims for towage or for salvage services rendered to

Navy vessels, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS ARISING FROM CRASH OF AIR FORCE AIRPLANE NEAR WOLD-CHAMBERLAIN AIR FIELD, MINNEAPOLIS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims settled and not settled, arising out of the crash of a United States Air Force airplane near Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn., on June 5, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS PAID UNDER MARITIME CLAIMS ACT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by that Department under the Maritime Claims Act of October 20, 1951, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by that Department under the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DR. HAROLD J. HECK

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Dr. Harold J. Heck (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GEORGE T. MOORE, CARL D. BERRY, AND DR. HAROLD J. HECK

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of George T. Moore, Carl D. Berry, and Dr. Harold J. Heck (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department, during the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act

of 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, for the period January 1, through June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Post Office Department, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF THE UNITED STATES *v.* HELDENFELS BROS. CONSTRUCTION CO.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the final settlement on August 28, 1956, of the claim of the *United States v. Heldenfels Bros. Construction Co.*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF THE UNITED STATES *v.* GULF OIL CORP.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the final settlement, on October 24, 1956, of the claim of the *United States v. Gulf Oil Corp.*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department during the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, confidential copies of orders issued granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Five letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Ho Kee alias Kee Ho, and Fred Alexander Haddix, Jr., from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended,

transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, and June 1, 1956, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Five letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Mo Ling Hwang-Chen nee Hwang, Cheung Kam Yin, William G. Yu-Ming Diao, Sing Chue, and Tai Look Wong, from reports transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, and April 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of George J. Martinek, Eva Martinek, and Carolina or Karla Martinek from a report transmitted to the Senate on March 1, 1956, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

A letter from the United States attorney, District of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report, for the period July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR

A letter from the Corporation Agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the financial statement of that legion for the period July 21 to September 30, 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPECIAL REPORT RELATING TO SEMI-ANNUAL REPORTS FOR THE PAYMENT OF CLAIMS BASED ON CORRECTIONS OF MILITARY RECORDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a special report for consideration in connection with the semiannual reports, respecting payment of claims based on corrections of military records, which the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury are required to make (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIM OF ERNEST HAGLER *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendation concerning the claim of Ernest Hagler against the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Commission, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIM PAID BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., reporting, pursuant to law, that the tort claim of Walter J. Sowell, of Bluemont, Va., had been settled during the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that government, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that administration, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that agency, for the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that administration, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that agency, for the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND REPORT OF SONS OF UNION VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR

A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Trenton, N. J., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit of the books of, and the annual report of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the accounts of that organization, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO INJURY, DISABILITY, AND DEATH SUFFERED BY EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT, RELATING TO COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN INJURIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries from war-risk hazards or during detention by a hostile force or person (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT RELATING TO ALLOWANCES TO SUPERINTENDENT OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL AND HIS ASSISTANTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report and letter concerning allowances in kind furnished the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and his two immediate assistants (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

A letter from the Chairman, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, transmitting an interim report of that committee, dated November 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

A letter from the Chairman, the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, Washington, D. C., transmitting a progress report of that committee, dated September 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN POSITIONS, NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the establishment of certain positions by that committee, during the calendar year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter, signed by the Chairman and members of the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, Wilson Dam, Alabama, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant

to law, a report on review of operation and maintenance of navigation projects, Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, dated January 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of operation, maintenance, and administration of recreational facilities at reservoir projects, Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, dated January 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Institution, for the year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter signed by the Chairman and members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated July 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures for the period July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FOR ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE ADMISSION OF RED CHINA INTO THE UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Chinese Embassy, Washington, D. C., signed by Hollington K. Tong, expressing his appreciation of the resolution recently adopted by the United States Senate opposing the admission of the Chinese Communist regime to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 17-XX

A concurrent resolution denouncing the usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States and demanding the preservation of our inherent rights

Whereas in the life of a democratic nation when it becomes necessary for the people to take notice of and enter a solemn protest against any usurpation of power by those who have been entrusted with high public office, and to demand, as of right, that public officers remain subservient to the people and that they desist from assuming powers which have not, by the people, been placed in their hands, the opinions of their fellow men require that the people set forth in clear and unmistakable language the causes which impel them to such action.

To the end that the declarations now about to be made may be thoroughly understood, and the motives which impel them may be fully appreciated, we first pronounce the following principles, each of which we hold to be an integral part of our American system of Government:

1. All political power is inherent in the people and all government derives all its powers from the consent of the governed.

2. When the people form a government by the adoption of a written constitution the words of that constitution are but the instrumentalities by which ideas, principles, and plans present in the minds of those who adopt the constitution are recorded for accuracy and for preservation to posterity.

3. Those who are temporarily invested with power over their fellow countrymen, by being chosen to occupy public offices provided for in a constitution, are charged with a solemn responsibility to exercise only such powers as, under such constitution, have been entrusted to them.

4. A division of the powers of government into three departments, executive, legislative, and judicial is expressed or implied in every constitution of the American Union, including the Constitution of the United States.

5. The Constitution of the United States is a grant of powers to the central Federal Government, and all powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, or to the people.

6. The judicial powers delegated to the Federal Government are vested by the Constitution in the Federal judiciary and include the power to interpret, construe and apply the Constitution of the United States.

7. The power to interpret, construe and apply the Constitution is limited to an ascertainment of the ideas, principles and thoughts that were in the minds of those who drafted and adopted the Constitution, including amendments thereto, and the application of those ideas, principles and thoughts to particular factual situations from time to time presented to the courts. The application of constitutional principles may differ with changing conditions, but the principles themselves are unchanging and unchangeable except by the people and then only by the method provided in the Constitution.

8. A judicial construction of the Constitution enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States and understood and acquiesced in by the executive department, the Congress and the people over a long period of time becomes as much a part of the fundamental law of the land as that which has been written in the Constitution itself, and is binding equally upon the people, the States of the Union, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Constitution of the United States may be amended only in the manner provided in the Constitution. In the course of history since the adoption of the Constitution the people have 21 times found it expedient to amend the Constitution, and when that unanimity of public opinion which justifies a change in the Constitution has developed among the people they have found no difficulty in effecting the changes they found desirable.

The assumption by any public official, or group of public officials, of power to change the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, other than by the method provided by article V of the Constitution, is an abuse of public trust and a tyrannical usurpation of power; and

Whereas under the Constitution of the United States when evidences of the assumption of tyrannical powers appear in the executive or in the Congress the people may, by means of the ballot, protect and preserve their liberties by the repudiation of those in office. But when the Federal judiciary, which is insulated from the heat of political differences by the life tenure of its membership, enters upon a course of action inimical to the rights of the people, this method of reform is unavailable. Under such circumstances those restraints which characterize men capable of self-government require that by orderly and peaceable means the inherent and unalienable rights and

powers of the people shall be utilized to restore those rights of which they have unjustly and unlawfully been deprived.

We call to the attention of all thinking Americans the following unwarranted and unauthorized acts of invasion of the powers reserved to the States and to the people:

(1) By decisions rendered May 17, 1954, in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, *Harry Briggs, Jr., et al., v. R. W. Elliott, et al.*, *Dorothy E. Davis, et al., v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia*, *Frances B. Gebhart, et al., v. Ethel Louise Belton, et al.* (347 U. S. 483, 98 L. Ed. 873), the Supreme Court of the United States denied to the sovereign States of the American Union the power to regulate public education by the use of practices first declared constitutional by the State of Massachusetts, adopted by the Congress, approved by the Executive, affirmed and reaffirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States and practiced by States for more than a century.

It has based these decisions upon matters of fact as to which the parties affected were not given an opportunity to offer evidence or cross examine the witnesses against them.

It has cited as authority for the assumed and asserted facts the unsworn writings of men, one of whom was the hireling of an active participant in the litigation. Others were affiliated with organizations declared by the Attorney General of the United States to be subversive, and one of whom, in the same writing which the Court cited as authority for its decision stated that the Constitution of the United States is "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions."

In reaching its conclusion the Supreme Court has disregarded its former pronouncements and attempted to justify such action by the expedient of imputing ignorance of psychology to men whose knowledge of the law and understanding of the Constitution could not be impugned, and has expressly predicated its determination of the rights of the people of the several sovereign States of the American Union upon the psychological conclusions of Kotinsky, Brameld and Myrdal, and their ilk, rather than the legal conclusions of Taft, Holmes, Van Devanter, Brandeis and their contemporaries upon the bench.

In reaching its conclusion the Court, professing itself to be unable to ascertain the intent of those who adopted the 14th amendment to the Constitution, arbitrarily chose to repudiate the solemn declaration of its meaning rendered under the sanctity of their oath of office by the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States at a time when all of its members were contemporaries of those who proposed, discussed, debated, submitted, and adopted the amendment.

However, much as citizens of other States may approve and applaud these decisions, they dare not embrace the theory upon which they are based nor the fallacies therein contained lest they themselves by the application of the same theory and fallacies bring destruction to their institutions and to their liberties.

(2) In a decision rendered May 21, 1956, in *Railway Employees Department, American Federation of Labor, International Association of Machinists, et al., v. Robert L. Hanson, et al.*, (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance) p. 633), the Supreme Court of the United States held that a union shop agreement negotiated between certain railroads and certain organizations of employees of such railroads which had been authorized by an act of the Congress superseded the right-to-work provisions of the constitution of the State of Nebraska and the State statutes enacted pursuant thereto.

The effect of this decision, made in a case instituted by free American citizens to enforce their rights under the Constitution of the United States, was to deny these American citizens the right to work at their chosen trade unless they became members

of and contributed to the funds of organizations to which they did not wish to belong and to which they did not wish to contribute of their substance.

The effect of this decision was to advise these free American citizens that their right to be immune from any deprivation of liberty or property without due process of law, supposedly guaranteed to them by their Federal Constitution, did not extend to their right to work, supposedly guaranteed by the constitution of their State, as against the demands of a nonofficial labor organization that they pay to it money to be expended in the negotiation of labor contracts, the terms of which these citizens might or might not seek or desire.

The effect of this decision is to vest in the Congress the power to prohibit, permit, or require, closed shops, union shops, or open shops or to outlaw unions in each and every industry in America whose activities come within the present expanded concept of interstate commerce.

The effect of this decision is to abrogate, with respect to all employment in interstate business, the constitutions and laws of those 17 sovereign American States which have sought to protect the rights of their citizens to a free and open labor market, making union membership optional with each worker, protecting him on the one hand from an employer who might desire the destruction of the union, and on the other hand from the union which might desire to exploit him or advocate policies which he did not endorse.

(3) By a decision rendered January 16, 1956, *Dantan George Rea v. United States of America* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance) p. 213), the Supreme Court held that it was within the power of the Federal courts to enjoin an officer of the executive department of the Federal Government from testifying in the courts of the State of New Mexico in a criminal prosecution of one charged with a violation of a statute of that State prohibiting the possession of marihuana.

In so doing the Court assumed the power to direct the activities of executive officers of the Federal Government to the extent of forbidding them from testifying voluntarily, or under the process of a State court, as to matters within their knowledge in a case in which no question of privilege or national security was involved.

In so doing the Court assumed power to control the administration of local justice in State courts by the indirect method of forbidding witnesses to testify in such State courts while giving lipservice to the letter of the rule which denies to the Federal courts any power to control the acts or proceedings of State courts.

In so doing the Court assumed power to fix the rules of evidence which should control the administration of justice in State courts.

In so doing the Supreme Court refused to follow the law as established by former decisions of that Court, which were followed and adhered to for many years.

(4) By a decision rendered April 2, 1956, in *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Steve Nelson* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance) p. 415), the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that, so long as the present Federal law providing punishment for sedition exists, the sovereign State of Pennsylvania and those 41 of her sister States who have enacted laws against sedition, are without power to enforce their statutes enacted for the purpose of preserving the lives and safety of their citizens from those who would by force and violence overthrow the Government of the United States, the States themselves, or any of their political subdivisions.

This decision was rendered in the case of an acknowledged member of the Communist Party who had been duly convicted

in the constitutional trial courts of Pennsylvania of violating the sedition laws of that commonwealth.

In reaching the conclusion announced, the Supreme Court refused to follow the previously accepted construction and interpretation of the Constitution of the United States as stated in unmistakable language in prior decisions of that Court.

In reaching the announced conclusion, the Court decried, and seemed to find obnoxious the fact that under the Pennsylvania law a private citizen could set in motion the legal processes by which those charged with conspiracy against the government of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania could be brought to trial and, if found guilty, be punished by due course of Pennsylvania law.

In reaching the announced conclusion the Court dismissed with a casual comment in a footnote to its decision the solemn declaration of the Congress that "Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

In reaching the announced conclusion the court did not limit the impact of its judgment to statutes involving sedition against the Government of the United States, but expressly pointed out that a State has no power to enact laws for its own protection, but must rely upon the Federal authorities for the suppression of sedition against the State itself or its political subdivisions.

(5) In a decision rendered April 23, 1956, in *Judson Griffin, et al. v. People of the State of Illinois* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance) p. 483), the Supreme Court of the United States held that the due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitution of the United States rendered illegal the imprisonment of one charged with armed robbery and duly convicted in the trial court of Illinois, unless the State of Illinois provided the defendant, free of charge, with a transcript of the proceedings to be used in an appeal of his conviction.

The basis of this decision was that, since the law of Illinois authorized appeals in criminal cases, and the particular defendant in question was insolvent, the 14th amendment required the State to pay the cost of his appeal.

The effect of this decision is to place upon each of the States the duty of guaranteeing the financial ability of every citizen to exercise constitutional rights.

(6) By a decision rendered April 9, 1956, in *Harry Slochover v. Board of Higher Education of the City of New York* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance) p. 449), the Supreme Court of the United States held that the city of New York had violated the Constitution of the United States by the summary discharge of a public employee who had refused to answer questions relative to his communistic activities and claimed the benefit of the 5th amendment to the Constitution in so doing.

In so holding the Court held invalid a charter provision of the city of New York designed to provide for the removal, as quickly as possible, of those public employees who were deemed by the people of that great city to be unfit to be entrusted with any part in the administration of the public affairs of the city.

In so holding the Court revoked the prompt removal from a State school of a teacher whose influence was deemed by the school authorities to be inimicable to the best interests of the students in such school.

In so holding the Court construed the due process clause of the Constitution to give to the Federal courts the power to examine into minute details of all administrative State action and to apply arbitrarily to such State action the personal concepts of the Justices of the Supreme Court rather than fixed principles of constitutional law; and

Whereas these, and other decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, can lead the student of law, of government, or of history to but one unavoidable conclusion:

As presently constituted, the Supreme Court of the United States has embraced the philosophy that the Constitution of the United States is not a declaration of fixed or definite principles, unchanging in their meaning, although varying in their application to different factual situations. On the contrary, recent decisions are obviously the result of a theory that changing conditions and variations in social and economic practices justify the Court in changing, by judicial fiat, the meaning of the Constitution in order that it may serve what the members of the Court deem to be the best interests of the people.

Unless the application of this concept of the powers of the Supreme Court of the United States in regard to the rights of the people, the powers of the different departments of government, and the separate and distinct powers of the States and of the Federal Government be stopped, the inevitable result will be to end the American system of constitutional government, and to substitute therefor government by a judicial oligarchy under which the States, and the executive and legislative departments of the Federal Government may exercise only such powers as the federal judiciary deems fit to permit them to exercise; and Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the House of Representatives concurring):

SECTION 1. That we, the people of the State of Florida, speaking by and through our duly elected representatives in the senate and house of representatives of the State of Florida, do hereby solemnly declare:

(1) That the Supreme Court of the United States of America as presently constituted knowingly, willfully, and over the most respectful protest of litigants before the court, including many of the sovereign States of the union, has determined to, and has entered upon a policy of substituting the personal and individual ideas of the members of the court as to what the Constitution of the United States should be for the letter of the Constitution as it was written by our forefathers, the meaning of the Constitution as it was understood by those who drafted it and voted for its adoption, and the intent of the Constitution as it has been declared by the highest court of the Nation over many years and in many able decisions.

(2) That the personal, social, economic, and political ideas of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States do not constitute the proper criterion for the measurement of States rights or the powers of the several Departments of the Federal Government or the rights of individual citizens.

(3) That acts of the Federal judiciary in willfully asserting a meaning of the Constitution unsupported by the written document, the history of the times in which it was adopted, the construction placed upon it by the contemporary courts and the meaning ascribed to it by the people for generations constitute usurpation of power which, if condoned by the people and allowed to continue, will destroy the American system of government.

SEC. 2. That, if wise and beneficent men may make changes in the Constitution that are beneficial in the light of changing conditions, others may, with equal propriety make changes which will destroy the rights of the people. It was to guard against conferring the power upon public officials to make mistakes that the people reserved unto themselves the power to amend the Constitution when changing conditions demand a change in the basis law.

That while disobedience to constituted authority is the mother of anarchy, it is the history of freemen that they will not supinely permit government to become the master of the people, and will never yield unrestrained authority to any group of public officers.

SEC. 3. That it is the duty of every public official sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and of every citizen who would maintain the principles of Government under which this Nation has grown to its present greatness, regardless of their views as to the abstract justice of the result of any of the acts of usurpation herein enumerated to insist, and we do hereby insist and demand that the Supreme Court of the United States recede from its arbitrary assertion of power to change the fundamental law of the land to meet the personal views of its members as to the present needs of the people, leaving to the people themselves the responsibility of determining when, and to what extent, their Constitution should be amended.

SEC. 4. That, and to this end we respectfully and earnestly urge the executive officers of the Nation, the Congress of the United States, the governor and the attorney general of each of our sister States, and the Bar of America, the traditional defender of constitutional Government, and all who love and reserve the Constitution of the United States, to join us in this declaration, and to do everything within the scope of their personal and official authority to initiate and effect an amendment to article X of the Constitution of the United States defining the powers reserved to the respective sovereign States, enumerating and defining the powers so reserved to include, among others, the power to regulate the fields of activity mentioned in this report.

SEC. 5. That copies of this resolution be sent to the chief executive officers of each State in the Union, the Members of Congress of the United States, the attorney general of each sister State, the American Bar Association and to any other persons designated by the Members of the legislature.

Approved by the Governor August 1, 1956.
Filed in Office of Secretary of State August 1, 1956.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

House Concurrent Resolution 10

Concurrent resolution interposing the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana against encroachment upon the police powers reserved to this State by the United States Constitution, and appealing to her sister States to resolve a question of contested powers

Be it resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana (the members elected to each house concurring):

That the Legislature of Louisiana express its firm resolution to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution of this State—as the same were originally adopted and have since been legally amended in the manner prescribed therein—against every attempt, whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the great principles embodied therein;

That the Legislature of Louisiana explicitly declares that the powers of the Federal Government result solely from the Constitution of the United States, a compact in which the several States are principals, and that, hence, the powers of the Federal Government, including all of its branches and agencies, are limited by the terms of the instrument creating that compact, and by the plain sense and intention of its provisions;

That the terms of this basic compact, and its plain sense and intention, are that the several States, the principals therein, have

agreed voluntarily to delegate certain of their sovereign powers, but only those sovereign powers specifically enumerated, to a Federal Government thus constituted, and that all powers not expressly delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people;

That this basic compact may be legally amended in one way, and in one way only, that is by ratification of a proposed amendment by the legislatures of not less than three-fourths of the States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution; that the judicial branch of the Federal Government has authority only in "cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution" and, hence, has no power or authority to amend the Constitution of the United States either by declaring a different meaning for the words therein found or otherwise;

That by its decision of May 17, 1954, in the school cases, the then occupants of the offices of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States attempted to amend the Constitution by declaring that regardless of the meaning or intention of the 14th amendment when adopted by the States (which was explicitly shown to be contrary to the decision in these cases) it would be construed, in view of changing conditions, to deprive the several States of authority over their respective public school systems never surrendered by them;

That following this decision a Federal District Court for the State of Louisiana, in the case entitled "*Bush et al. v. Orleans Parish School Board et al.*" attempted to declare unconstitutional certain portions of the Constitution and Statutes of the State of Louisiana, some dealing with segregation of the races in public schools and others dealing simply with the administration of public schools, basing its opinion upon the proposed change in the Constitution of the United States decreed by the Supreme Court in its above mentioned May 17, 1954, decision;

That the Legislature of Louisiana, further, takes cognizance of the fact that under this proposed judicial amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of several of our sister States relating to the segregation of races in public parks and recreational activity have been declared unconstitutional by Federal courts, and litigation, and threat of litigation, on this score exists in the State of Louisiana;

That the State of Louisiana, and the other States of the United States, have never surrendered the right to regulate their public-school system or their public parks and recreational activities, whether in the 14th amendment or any other provision of the United States Constitution, that hence, if this State fails to clearly assert its power in regard to these matters it might be construed as a tacit surrender thereof and that such submissive acquiescence to palpable, deliberate and dangerous usurpation of such power would, in the end, lead to the surrender of all powers, and inevitably to the obliteration of the sovereignty of the States, contrary to the sacred compact by which this Union of States was created;

That the question of usurped power asserted in this resolution is not within the province of the usurper to determine, and, hence, under these circumstances, the judgment of all the principals to the compact must be sought to resolve the question;

Therefore, the Legislature of Louisiana, appealing first to our Creator as the only Supreme Authority, next appeals to her sister States for that decision which only they are qualified under our mutual compact to make, and respectfully requests them to join in taking appropriate steps, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, by which an amendment designed to set at rest the usurpation herein complained of may be proposed to all the States.

And, be it further resolved, that until the usurpation herein complained of by the State of Louisiana be settled by legal constitutional amendment, the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby solemnly declare the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, the decision of the Federal District Court in the case of *Bush et al. v. Orleans Parish School Board et al.*, and any similar decisions that might be rendered in connection with the public-school system and public parks and recreational facilities, insofar as such decisions may affect or apply to the sovereign State of Louisiana, to be in violation of the Constitutions of the United States, and of the State of Louisiana; and,

We declare, further, our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably and constitutionally available to us, to void this illegal encroachment upon the rights of the several States, and we do hereby urge our sister States to take prompt and deliberate action to check further encroachment by the Federal Government upon the reserved powers of each of the States.

The Governor of Louisiana is respectfully requested to transmit a copy of the foregoing resolution to the governing body of every parish, city and town in this State; to the executive authority of each of our sister States; to the Clerk of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States; to Louisiana's Senators and Representatives in the Congress, and to the President of the United States and each of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States for their information.

LETHE E. TEAGAR,
Lieutenant Governor and President
of the Senate.

LOUIS M. WIMBERLY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to setting aside a day each year to be known as Children's Day

Whereas the Franco-American War Veterans, Inc., Department of Massachusetts, in convention assembled at Fall River, Mass., on June 24, 1956, have, at the suggestion of C. P. O. Henry Boucher of the U. S. S. *Saratoga*, requested the General Court of Massachusetts to memorialize the Congress of the United States relative to setting aside a day each year to be known as Children's Day; and

Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts is cognizant of the significance and value of a Children's Day at which time the leaders of tomorrow, our children of today, may be appropriately honored and recognized: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation setting aside the second Sunday of August in each year as Children's Day; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Senate, July 31, 1956.

Adopted.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
Assistant Clerk, Acting Clerk.
House of Representatives, August 1, 1956.
Adopted, in concurrence.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

A true copy.

Attest:

[SEAL]

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Resolution of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolution memorializing the United States Senate to adopt Senate Resolution No. 298, pertaining to objections by certain foreign countries to American citizens in the military and other services on grounds of certain affiliation

Whereas there is pending before the United States Senate a resolution, No. 298, pertaining to discrimination in the assignment of American citizens to military, diplomatic, or other service within any foreign country, solely because of that country's objection on grounds of religious affiliation to any American or class of Americans; and

Whereas the freedom and independence of every American citizen, for which American youth have fought and died, are seriously threatened by such action: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, where the rights of freemen were born, being cognizant of the peril which faces these rights, hereby urges the Members of the United States Senate to adopt Resolution No. 298; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to each Member of Congress from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, July 25, 1956.

Adopted.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, Clerk.

A true copy.

Attest:

[SEAL]

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

House Resolution No. 10

A resolution urging the Congress of the United States to examine the United States Postal Regulations and Federal legislation concerning the transmitting of obscene material to members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and to make recommended changes necessary to curtail such practices

Whereas allegations have been made that the members of the United States Armed Forces are receiving through the mails of the United States large amounts of obscene materials from many sources, supplied to them by well-meaning friends as well as groups of a more devious nature; and

Whereas many complaints of a general nature have been made by members of the United States Armed Forces themselves that they sicken of such a flood of obscene materials being sent to them; and

Whereas in the interests of maintaining a high morale among the members of the United States Armed Forces it is well within the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States to be concerned with such complaints and to make a full and complete investigation, in cooperation with the authorities of the United States Armed Forces, of such practices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States is urged to examine the United States Postal Regulations and Federal legislation concerning the transmitting of obscene material to members of the United States Armed Forces, and to make recommendations necessary to curtail this practice; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress and to the Michigan delegation of the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the House July 18, 1956.

NORMAN E. PHILLES,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joint resolution of condemnation and protest against oppressive usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the several States of the Union and the Congress of the United States to bring to an end this tyrannical usurpation of power

Whereas the General Assembly of North Carolina recognizes its allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States and is ever mindful of its responsibility to defend the Constitution of the United States against every attempt, foreign or domestic, to undermine the dual structure of this Union or to destroy those fundamental principles embodied in the written Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the founders of this great Nation, fearful of the tyranny that naturally and always follows the unrestricted concentration of governmental power, secured the passage of the "Bill of Rights," consisting of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution; and

Whereas the 9th and 10th amendments to the Constitution expressly and explicitly limit the Federal Government to specific powers delegated to it by the terms of the compact and reserved to the States and their people all other powers, unless specifically prohibited by it to the States; and

Whereas the General Assembly of North Carolina is ever mindful of the admonition that "frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty"; and

Whereas the Constitution is a solemn compact between the States, and the Federal Government is the creature born of that compact from sovereign powers inherently residing in the States and their people but delegated solely for the purposes clearly and manifestly set forth in the Constitution; and

Whereas the methods and procedures for amending the Constitution of the United States are distinctly and plainly stated in article V of that instrument in these words: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress;" and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States may be validly amended only in the manner prescribed by the Constitution itself, and the United States Supreme Court has never had, does not now have, and should never possess, the power and authority to amend the Constitution; and

Whereas neither the judicial power granted the United States Supreme Court in article III of the Federal Constitution nor such appellate jurisdiction as Congress has conferred, or may confer, can constitute that Court the dominant and ultimate authority with the power of determining without regard for the Constitution what is and is not in the best interest of the Nation; and

Whereas by its decision of May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States, in seeking to establish itself as the dominant and ultimate policy-setting agency of the Nation, in effect amended the Constitution by interpreting the 14th amendment in a manner clearly contrary to the well-settled construction of that amendment; and

Whereas the State of North Carolina in ratifying the 14th amendment did not intend to delegate to the Federal Government the power to deny to the States the inherent right to operate racially separate schools;

and when the 14th amendment was ratified, there were 37 States in the Union, and 23 of those States had segregated schools and others had no public schools at all; and the Congress which proposed the 14th amendment established segregated schools in the District of Columbia; and both State and Federal courts, without exception, beginning with a decision of the Massachusetts' Supreme Court in 1848, and subsequently followed by the courts of Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and others, recognized the power of the States to operate a system of separate public schools; and

Whereas the General Assembly of North Carolina relying upon the United States Supreme Court's own interpretation of the 14th amendment and the numerous and uncontradicted decisions of other Federal and State courts established and developed a segregated public-school system; and North Carolina properly assumed that it could rely upon congressional action and earlier court decisions as is demonstrated by the language of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Myers v. United States* (1927): " * * * when Congress, after full consideration and with the acquiescence and long practice of all branches of the Government, has established the construction of the Constitution, it may not by its mere subsequent legislation reverse such construction. It is not given power by itself thus to amend the Constitution;" and

Whereas the General Assembly of North Carolina, mindful that powers assumed by the Supreme Court in one field today will become precedents for further assumption of power in other fields tomorrow and recognizing, as did the founders of this great Nation, that tyranny naturally and always follows naked power; and the Supreme Court of the United States has recently denied to the States the right to have laws of their own to deal with subversion or espionage against the Nation; and the States have been denied the right to dismiss individuals from their employment who refuse to answer questions concerning their connections with communism by invoking the fifth amendment, and the fears of Thomas Jefferson are rapidly becoming realities—"The great object of my fear is the Federal judiciary. That body, like gravity, ever acting, with noiseless foot, and unalarming advance * * * is engulfing insidiously the special governments into the jaws of that which feeds them"; and

Whereas there is implicit in these recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court a most grievous and deplorable disrespect for declared and established law; and

Whereas by reason of this disrespect for declared and established law on the part of the United States Supreme Court, the people's faith and confidence in the judicial ability and temperament and judicial self-restraint of our highest Federal judges has been most severely shaken; and

Whereas the General Assembly of North Carolina recognizes its solemn duty to help alert the Nation to the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States, by interpretations and constructions of the Constitution, encroaches upon the reserved powers of the States; and our failure to discharge the solemn duty to alert our people and the Nation would constitute passive acquiescence in dangerous precedents aimed at undermining our democratic form of Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the States have never granted to the United States Supreme Court, or any other court, the power to amend the Federal Constitution, nor does the Federal Government possess any powers not delegated to it by the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the grievous and deplorable disrespect for the declared and established law of the land on the part of the United States Supreme Court constitutes a most dangerous and oppressive usurpation of the power of the Congress and the rights of the States and the people, and a grave threat to constitutional government in these United States.

SEC. 3. That the State of North Carolina does condemn and protest the oppressive usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 4. That the State of North Carolina does call upon all States and the Congress of the United States to bring to an end this tyrannical usurpation of power by the United States Supreme Court and to prevent now and in the future other and further encroachment upon the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people, to the end that constitutional Government shall ever be preserved.

SEC. 5. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor and the legislature of each of the States, to the presiding officers of each of the Houses of the Congress of the United States, to North Carolina's Representatives and Senators in the Congress, to the President of the United States, and to the several judges of the United States Supreme Court.

SEC. 6. This resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 27th day of July 1956.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Anchorage, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide appropriations for authorized Federal buildings and post offices; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolutions adopted by the Downville Civic Club, and Naomi Parlor No. 36, Native Daughters of the Golden West, both of Downville, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to return to the gold standard; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Rhode Island Textile Association, Providence, R. I., signed by E. F. Walker, secretary-treasurer, transmitting a statement issued by the executive committee of the Rhode Island Textile Association on August 1, 1956, relating to conditions in the textile industry (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted at the annual convention of the Hawaii Postal Employees Association, at Hilo, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the exemption of Federal income tax on annuities received by employees under the Civil Service Act; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Assembly of Captive European Nations, New York, N. Y., relating to an investigation of Communist aggression against Hungary, and Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Kalman Govrik, president of the Hungarian Baross Gabor Association, St. Paul, Minn., transmitting copies of circulars relating to Hungarian independence (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Republican Club of Castro Valley, Calif., protesting against the admission of Red China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by The Guardians of Liberty, an association of nationality groups, at a special meeting held in Miami, Fla., on October 29, 1956, relating to the Communist occupation of Hungary and other Slavic countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the cities of Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine, Wis., held under the auspices of the Club of the National Guard of Lithuania in exile in Wisconsin, at the city of Racine, in observance of the 38th anniversary of the armed forces day of independent Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Dallas, Tex., relating to communism in art; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Ethnic Groups of the American Friends of Antisoviet Block of Nations, relating to the occupation of Hungary by Russian troops, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held under the auspices of the Buffalo Chapter, American Friends of Antisoviet Block of Nations, Inc., Ukrainian Division, at Buffalo, N. Y., relating to the freedom of all captive countries now under Russian domination, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of Francis Jean Reuter, of College Park, Md., remonstrating against the adoption of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 88, 84th Congress) proclaiming faith in the Word of God and favoring renewed observation of the Ten Commandments (with an accompanying pamphlet); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Alfred J. Fortino, of St. Louis, Michigan, relating to conditions in Hungary, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Council for the Liberation of Captive Peoples from Soviet Domination, Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the denial of recognition of the present Communist Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Guardians of Liberty, an association of nationality groups, at Miami, Fla., relating to the withdrawal of Russian troops from Hungary, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Polish Association of Former Political Prisoners in the Soviet and Nazi Concentration Camps, Detroit, Mich., relating to the freedom of all countries under Soviet domination (with an accompanying pamphlet); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Catholic Laymen's League of Orange and Rockland Counties, New York, condemning the invasion of Hungary by Soviet Russia, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the American National Retail Jewelers Association, New York, N. Y., relating to the elimination of unnecessary expenditures by the Government which are not essential to the national defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the American War Dads, Inc., Nebraska Association, favoring the enactment of legislation to grant relief to the American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the National Society of Public Accountants, at Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Palmer, Alaska, relating to payments in lieu of taxes and assessment on Federal property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Palmer, Alaska, relating to Federal insurance of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A statement in the nature of a memorial, adopted by the Fort Yukon (Alaska) Town Meeting, on September 4, 1956, remonstrating against the existing liquor laws of the Terri-

tory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Casa Grande, Ariz., relating to the Buttes Dam project on the Gila River in central Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Employer and Employee Service, Honolulu, Hawaii, signed by Wm. H. Crozier, Jr., enclosing a resolution which was adopted at a public mass meeting held at Aala Park, Honolulu, Hawaii, on July 4, 1956, relating to conditions of employment, and so forth, in the Territory of Hawaii (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Sacramento, Calif., Chinese Benevolent Association, signed by Walter Fong, president, and Rev. Hiram Fong, English Secretary, embodying a resolution adopted by that association, favoring the enactment of legislation to renew the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, relating to immigration quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting on May 22, 1956, favoring the repeal of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting on May 22, 1956, relating to capital punishment in the sale of narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting on May 22, 1956, relating to human brotherhood and freedom for all men; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of William Roundtree, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Lula May Heard, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Ohio Bell, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Mrs. Robert Pinckney Tucker, chairman, 1937 Supreme Court Security League, relating to qualifications of Justices (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Huestis Atwood, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Alfred J. Jacobi, of New York, N. Y., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the United Chinese Society of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of C. S. Bowen, of Greenville, S. C., relating to the seating of the two Senators from South Carolina in the 85th Congress (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Crusade of Safety Foundation, Columbus, Ohio, relating to a charter of incorporation by that foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted at the 65th annual convention of the Wisconsin Library Association, at Madison, Wis., expressing the thanks of that association for the enactment of the Library Services Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Two resolutions adopted by the first district, Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars, relating to the return of the Veterans' Administration regional office to the San Diego area; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the American Unitarian Association at its annual meeting on

May 22, 1956, relating to the allocation of funds for the support of public schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the State Hospital and Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Authorities on November 5, 1956, at their annual conference with the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, extending their appreciation for the enactment of the Hill-Burton construction program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted at the sixth annual convention of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, at Miami, Fla., endorsing the proposal for the establishment of the Pan American University in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Bert S. Crossland Post, No. 170, the American Legion, Department of California, relating to complaints on the treatment of veterans at the post office at Torrance, Calif.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Palmer, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the construction of military access roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Palmer, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the construction of arterial highways through municipalities adjacent to national forests; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Greater Hazleton (Pa.) Community-Area New Development Organization, Inc., commonly known as Can Do, Inc., favoring the inclusion of the thoroughway from Stroudsburg to Sharon, Pa., as a part of the Federal road-construction program; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Anthracite Motor Club, of Hazleton, Pa., relating to the construction of additional highway facilities in the vicinity of Hazleton; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter from the Trade Union Council, Liberal Party of New York State, New York, N. Y., transmitting petitions signed by sundry citizens of the States of New York and New Jersey, favoring the abolition of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation instructing the American Battle Monuments Commission to design and construct a monument or memorial in honor of those who died in recapturing the Aleutian Islands in World War II; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Furriers Joint Council of New York, N. Y., favoring the abolition of rule 22 of the Senate Rules of Procedure; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Young Democratic Clubs of West Virginia, Moundsville, W. Va., signed by Steven D. Narick, treasurer, transmitting a resolution adopted by that organization, expressing condolences on the death of the late Harley M. Kilgore (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Ernest Gruening, William A. Egan, and Ralph J. Rivers, relating to the election of Senators and a Representative of the Territory of Alaska; ordered to lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF RULE 22

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on Friday last, I announced that today I was going to submit a resolution proposing to amend the Senate rules. I have

had the amendment drafted, but I shall withhold submitting it until Wednesday when there will be more time.

I have been in consultation with the distinguished majority leader and with other Senators on both sides of the aisle. I hope that on Wednesday the resolution will be in such shape that it may receive substantial bipartisan sponsorship.

For the information of the Senate, however—although I am not submitting the resolution at this time—I should like to read the proposed resolution in its present form, which is slightly different from the form I read on last Friday. It now reads as follows:

That subsection 2 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended (1) by striking out "except subsection 3 of rule 22," and (2) by striking out "two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn" and inserting in lieu thereof "two-thirds of the Senators present and voting."

Sec. 2. Subsection 3 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and of subsection 2 of this rule."

Sec. 3. Rule 32 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting "1." immediately preceding "At", and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"2. The rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules."

At this time I have read the proposed amendment of the rule merely in order that the Senate may be informed. The resolution is not being submitted today, but will be submitted on next Wednesday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have just heard the distinguished minority leader make his statement about the submission of a resolution proposing to amend rule 22. It would help very greatly if, when he submits his proposed resolution, he would move its immediate consideration, without reference to a committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say that, so far as the minority leader is concerned, when he submits the proposed resolution on next Wednesday—and he hopes that at that time it will receive bipartisan sponsorship—it will be his intention that it go in the regular order to the Committee on Rules and Administration, so that it may be considered along with such other proposed amendments of the rules as may be submitted, and may be reported in the regular order.

Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that, insofar as I have any influence, I hope we can have very early consideration in the Senate of a change in rule 22.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can well remember, Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, the extreme solicitude of the Senator from California that early action be taken on a change in the rules. My colleague, at that time, Senator Lucas, then occupied the seat of majority leader now occupied by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]; and I can remember that at virtually every session of the Senate, the Senator from

California was on his feet, demanding that action be taken in regard to amending rule 22.

I hope that in this case the Senator from California will be equally solicitous; and I see no reason why the proposed resolution, if he is so anxious about it, should be referred to the Rules Committee. The resolution could be moved for immediate consideration. When it is moved for immediate consideration, I hope the existing section 3 of rule 22 will be adjudged unconstitutional and therefore not applicable to any debate which may ensue.

When consideration is given to this proposal, whether on the floor or in committee, I think we should try to find out the precise meaning of some of the subtly phrased provisions of the proposed rule. In particular I should like to call attention to section 3 of the Knowland resolution. This provides that "the rules of the Senate shall carry over from Congress to Congress unless they are changed as provided in these rules."

This would appear to be an attempt to bind or limit the constitutional rule-making power of the Senate in a future Congress, in direct violation of the constitutional principles set forth in the brief of the proponents of the recent Anderson resolution and endorsed in the opinion of the Vice President last Friday.

If this is its intended or practical effect, there will be strong opposition to this provision. I hope the Senate will never again try to fasten shackles upon future Senates as was attempted in 1949. For these very fundamental reasons, clarification of the Knowland proposal is imperative.

Now, Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. PORTER], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I submit a resolution proposing changes in rule 22. It provides, first, that limitation of debate may be effected by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting two calendar days after a petition signed by 16 Senators has been presented to the Senate, and by a majority vote of those Senators "duly chosen and sworn," that is a constitutional majority, namely, by 49 of the 96 Senators, 15 calendar days—excluding Sundays and legal holidays—after a petition is presented by 16 Senators to limit debate.

Such a change would permit virtually 3 weeks of debate after a petition had been presented unless limited by two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting, and thereafter would permit cloture to be applied by a constitutional majority. In practice, of course, a petition to limit debate is not submitted until after extensive debate has already occurred.

I send the resolution to the desk, and ask that it lie there for 1 day. I hope that other Senators whom we have not been able to see this morning, but who may be in favor of the general proposal, will serve as cosponsors.

Mr. President, I believe that the vote taken on last Friday indicates that there is a very strong and growing feeling in the country that the practice of the filibuster in the United States Senate should be limited. Four years ago, when this question was brought up, as all of us know, those of us who were opposed to the filibuster mustered only 21 votes. This time we mustered 38 votes, and 2 of our supporters were absent; and we believe the numbers will increase in the future.

Despite the determined opposition of the leaders of both parties, the forces of reform made a fine showing.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that there also be printed in the RECORD an abstract of this resolution.

There being no objection, the abstract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and the resolution (S. Res. 17) submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, for himself and other Senators, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to lie on the table for 1 day, as follows:

That section 2 of rule 22 of the standing rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"2. (a) If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule 3 or rule 6 or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question: "Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"(b) If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule 3 or rule 6 or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business,

ness, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this subsection, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the 15th calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays), he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a ye-a-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of."

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of rule 22 of the standing rules of the Senate is repealed.

The abstract of the resolution (S. Res. 17) submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, is as follows:

PROPOSED CHANGES IN RULE 22

Debate may be limited by two-thirds of those present and voting 2 calendar days after a petition has been submitted by 16 Senators and by a majority of those chosen and sworn (49) after 15 calendar days.

ABSTRACT OF PROVISION

(1) Substitutes for section 2 of rule 22, which requires 64 affirmative votes to limit debate:

(a) A provision that debate may be limited by a vote of two-thirds of those Senators present and voting 2 calendar days after a petition signed by 16 Senators has been presented to the Senate; and

(b) A new subsection which states that debate may be limited by a majority vote of those Senators "duly chosen and sworn" (49) 15 calendar days (excluding Sundays and legal holidays) after a petition is presented by 16 Senators to limit debate.

(2) Leaves intact the present provisions with respect to a petition by 16 Senators, and the procedures following a favorable vote on a motion to limit debate; that is, that each Senator shall be limited to 1 hour and that no dilatory motion may be presented, etc.

(3) Deletes section 3 of rule 22 which states that there can be no limitation of debate whatsoever on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a change in the rules of the Senate.

(4) Clearly provides that the new cloture provision applies to a motion to proceed to consider a change in the rules by the broad language which includes "any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business."

This is to insure that the new language does not restore the loophole of the 1917 rule.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 2. A bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. PURTELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 3. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 4. A bill to prevent the service or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial passenger aircraft and military aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to prevent the allocation of procurement contracts to certain designated geographical areas, and for other purposes; and

S. 6. A bill to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies or instrumentalities; to the Committee on Government Operations

S. 7. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a laboratory for a study of the utilization of the soil and water resources of the Southeastern United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 8. A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 9. A bill to deny tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to any organization which engages in the promotion of litigation to which it is not a party; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 10. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to provide for participation by tobacco producers in the acreage reserve program on the basis of 1956 acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 11. A bill to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 12. A bill for the relief of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign

Missions Conference of North America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 13. A bill for the relief of Kuo Cheng Wu and his wife, Edith Wu, and their two sons, Hsiu-Kwang Wu and Hsiu-Huang Wu;

S. 14. A bill for the relief of Vizulis Lagzdins;

S. 15. A bill for the relief of Margaret C. Morris;

S. 16. A bill for the relief of Lucy Lin and her minor child, Peter Lin;

S. 17. A bill for the relief of Patrick K. Y. Yip;

S. 18. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Renda; and

S. 19. A bill for the relief of Shu Tah Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 20. A bill for the relief of the widow of Col. Claud C. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 21. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 22. A bill to preserve rates of compensation of wage board employees whose positions are reduced in grade;

S. 23. A bill to provide for the appointment of the heads of regional and district offices of the Post Office Department by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

S. 24. A bill to grant equitable compensatory time to postal employees;

S. 25. A bill relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees; and

S. 26. A bill to establish a plan and appropriate procedures for the promotion of employees of the Government on the basis of merit; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 27. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 28. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; and

S. 29. A bill to repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 30. A bill to authorize the taxation of certain Federal real property by State and local tax authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 31. A bill to be known as the Urgent Minerals Purchase Program Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1957;

S. 32. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada;

S. 33. A bill to provide for the allocation of portions of the costs of Davis Dam and Reservoir to servicing the Mexican Water Treaty, and for other purposes;

S. 34. A bill to provide relief for producers of certain critical minerals, metals, and materials indispensable in the construction of jet engines;

S. 35. A bill to provide that the Governor and secretary of the Territory of Alaska shall be elected by the people of that Territory; and

S. 36. A bill to provide for the election of the Governor and secretary of the Territory of Hawaii by the people of the Territory; for

the appointment by the Governor of the justices and judges of the courts of the Territory; and for the formation of a constitutional government by the people of the Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 37. A bill to protect the security of the United States by preventing the employment by the United States of persons found to be disloyal to the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 38. A bill to authorize river improvement on the Truckee and Carson Rivers and tributaries, California and Nevada, in order to provide for additional flood control protection on the Truckee and Carson Rivers; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 39. A bill to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LONG, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 40. A bill to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 41. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy or his designee to convey a two thousand four hundred seventy-seven and forty-three-one hundredths-acre tract of land, avigation and sewer easements, in Tarrant and Wise Counties, Tex., situated about 20 miles northwest of the city of Fort Worth, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 42. A bill to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 43. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 44. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands in the State of New Mexico; and

S. 45. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell to the village of Central, State of New Mexico, certain lands administered by him formerly part of the Fort Bayard Military Reservation, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 46. A bill to amend the act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44, 25 U. S. C. 631 and the following), so as to permit the Navaho Indian Tribe to lease tribal lands for residential and other purposes for a term of not to exceed 99 years;

S. 47. A bill to authorize the further extension of certain noncompetitive oil or gas leases issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended; and

S. 48. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 49. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. (See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 50. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. (See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 51. A bill for the relief of Mary Barne and her two minor children, Steran Barne and Dinah Barne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 52. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 53. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 54. A bill to amend section 9 of the Navajo-Hopi Indian Rehabilitation Act to extend the matching formula provided by such section to State plans under the Social Security Act for the permanently and totally disabled and to administrative expenditures under the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 55. A bill to repeal section 221 and amend certain other sections of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 56. A bill for the relief of George P. Provencal;

S. 57. A bill for the relief of Mordecai Israel;

S. 58. A bill for the relief of Duk Chang Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 59. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of Colorado to William M. Proper; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 60. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 61. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Young Women's Christian Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 62. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas;

S. 63. A bill for the relief of Joan Yung-en Chao;

S. 64. A bill for the relief of Maria Lenz;

S. 65. A bill for the relief of Helen Cruz Ball; and

S. 66. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Hamasaki Fawcett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 67. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of those leaders who pioneered in the field of mental health;

S. 68. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Dr. Samuel J. Crumline, who pioneered in the field of public health education;

S. 69. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special stamp in commemoration of the memory of Christopher "Kit" Carson;

S. 70. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; and

S. 71. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON (by request):

S. 72. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 73. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of Amelia Earhart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 74. A bill to amend part VII, subchapter B, chapter I, subtitle A, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. (68A Stat. 69); to the Committee on Finance.

S. 75. A bill for the relief of Vincent Lee Lao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 76. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 77. A bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 78. A bill to provide for the maintenance and operation of the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 79. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Karras alias Costas Karras;

S. 80. A bill for the relief of Maria Adelaide Alessandrini; and

S. 81. A bill for the relief of Luigi Frione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 82. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAFEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. SCHOEPPLE, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 83. A bill to provide means for further securing and protecting the civil rights of

persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 84. A bill to be known as the Defense Cloud Modification Act of 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 85. A bill to provide for the review and revision of certain soil-bank contracts relating to 1956 wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 86. A bill to provide for an experimental research program in cloud modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 87. A bill for the relief of Pavel Blaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 88. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to provide that the Federal National Mortgage Association shall exercise its special assistance functions by purchasing mortgages securing loans which are guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 89. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use up to 25 percent of the National Service Life Insurance Fund for the purchase of loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 90. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Nasseff;

S. 91. A bill for the relief of Victor Charles Hunt;

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Robert Karia;

S. 93. A bill for the relief of Anna Teresa Steinhäuser and Dominic Paul Steinhäuser (Hiroshi Tsuruda);

S. 94. A bill for the relief of Lee Chong Taik;

S. 95. A bill for the relief of Yu Tseng Hsi;

S. 96. A bill for the relief of Corazon A. Manayan; and

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cheng-en Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 98. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 99. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Winona, Minn., for flood-control purposes;

S. 100. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River, Minn., for navigational purposes;

S. 101. A bill to authorize certain flood protection work on Ruffy Brook and Lost River, Minn.;

S. 102. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Root River at Rushford, Minn., for flood-control purposes; and

S. 103. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 104. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 105. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District

of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 106. A bill to exempt motor vehicles sold for the use of religious and nonprofit educational institutions from Federal excise tax;

S. 107. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits;

S. 108. A bill to exempt shipments of livestock from the tax on transportation of property;

S. 109. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise taxes on household-type equipment;

S. 110. A bill to repeal the tax on admission, refreshment, service, and merchandise at roofgardens, cabarets, and other similar places;

S. 111. A bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax on electric flatirons and electric ironers;

S. 112. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property;

S. 113. A bill to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons and property;

S. 114. A bill to repeal the excise tax on the transportation of coal;

S. 115. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicagoland Commerce and Industry Exposition, to be held at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 116. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit, and for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois;

S. 117. A bill to amend section 753 of title 28 of the United States Code to prescribe more fully the duties and obligations of official reporters appointed by district courts of the United States;

S. 118. A bill for the relief of the General Box Co.;

S. 119. A bill for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.;

S. 120. A bill for the relief of James F. Walsh;

S. 121. A bill for the relief of the Florida Dehydration Co.;

S. 122. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sinclair G. Stanley;

S. 123. A bill for the relief of Dr. James R. P. Wong;

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Josephine Suydam;

S. 125. A bill for the relief of Vasil Theodosovitch Stepanchuk;

S. 126. A bill for the relief of Ljubischa Nikolich;

S. 127. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Cosentino and Francesca Maria Cosentino;

S. 128. A bill for the relief of Nicola Accettura;

S. 129. A bill to amend the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), and for other purposes; and

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Frosso Spiliotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 131. A bill for the relief of Vermont, Ipava, and Table Grove Unit School District Numbered 2, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 132. A bill to reduce postage rates on parcels containing only food, clothing, medicines, or drugs sent by mail for relief purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 133. A bill creating the city of Saint Francisville Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

S. 134. A bill authorizing the acquisition of certain lands in the Mississippi Lake, Ill., in connection with the operation of Illinois and Mississippi Canal, and for other purposes; and

S. 135. A bill to authorize certain improvements of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Margaret Barner Muentsch Cox;

S. 137. A bill for the relief of Hans Paul Lange;

S. 138. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Rustler;

S. 139. A bill for the relief of Maria D. F. Piadis;

S. 140. A bill for the relief of Jan Szpytman;

S. 141. A bill for the relief of Jean Alma Walsh and Jennifer Elaine Walsh;

S. 142. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Suyama;

S. 143. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fricano, Maria Sceiba Fricano, Stefano Fricano and Vincenzo (Jimmy) Fricano; and

S. 144. A bill for the relief of Lucrecia Zuckermann Podesta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 145. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the Upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 146. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey certain property located in the vicinity of Montgomery, Montgomery County, Ala., to the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 147. A bill for the relief of Guido William Grambergs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 148. A bill to provide that the daily ration of personnel in the Armed Forces shall include at least 1 quart of milk per day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

By Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 149. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 150. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust corporate normal tax and surtax rates; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 151. A bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 152. A bill for the relief of George P. Nelson;

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Tsui Yung Wong;

S. 154. A bill for the relief of H. B. Woolf and H. B. Woolf, Jr.;

S. 155. A bill for the relief of Abraham Harry Wyman;

S. 156. A bill for the relief of M. F. Comer Bridge & Foundation Co.;

S. 157. A bill for the relief of Frosene Nichols; and

S. 158. A bill for the relief of Hewey Malachi Mackey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 159. A bill to provide additional cotton acreage for 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 160. A bill for the relief of Georgios Ioannou;

S. 161. A bill for the relief of Elias Youssef Mikhael (Ellis Joseph Michael);

S. 162. A bill for the relief of Jew Gim Gee;

S. 163. A bill to extend the period for filing claims under the War Claims Act of 1948;

S. 164. A bill for the relief of John G. Michael; and

S. 165. A bill for the relief of Arthur LeRoy Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 166. A bill to amend the laws granting education and training benefits to certain veterans so as to extend, with respect to certain individuals, the period during which such benefits may be offered; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 167. A bill to allow a credit of \$7 against the manufacturers' excise tax in the case of ultrahigh frequency television receiving sets; and

S. 168. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of minimum old-age insurance benefit; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 169. A bill for the relief of Basa Alonso Dominguez;

S. 170. A bill for the relief of Maria Karageorge; and

S. 171. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prescribe certain qualifications for persons appointed as members of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 172. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from \$10,000 to \$20,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 173. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to eliminate the requirement that an individual have attained 50 years of age in order to be eligible for disability benefits thereunder and repeal the provision which requires that the amount of disability benefits thereunder be reduced by the amount of certain other benefits payable by reason of the same disability; and

S. 174. A bill to provide for accrued servicemen's indemnity payments in certain cases; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. Young):

S. 175. A bill to allow an additional income-tax exemption for a dependent child who is a full-time college student; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 176. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to permit the importation free of duty of religious vestments and regalia presented without charge to a church or to certain religious, educational, or charitable organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the individual exemption for income tax purposes from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 178. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edward J. Smith (nee Concetta Chiodo) and her daughter, Roberta Smith;

S. 179. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, render judgment upon the claim of Col. Walter E. Cole for retirement from the Army of the United States due to a service-connected disability; and

S. 180. A bill for the relief of Lloyd Lindbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 181. A bill to amend section 4201 of title 18 of the United States Code;

S. 182. A bill for the relief of Anne Schwelmbach;

S. 183. A bill for the relief of Anne Schwelmbach;

S. 184. A bill for the relief of Mary C. Frederick;

S. 185. A bill for the relief of Mary Palanuk;

S. 186. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, render judgment upon the claim of Col. Walter E. Cole for retirement from the Army of the United States due to a service-connected disability;

S. 187. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kalyna Maya Chalk; and

S. 188. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Peter V. Bosch; and

S. 190. A bill for the relief of Jean Pfeifer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 191. A bill to provide for loans to individuals for the purpose of enabling them to obtain a college or university education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 192. A bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees;

S. 193. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 194. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees;

S. 195. A bill to amend the first section of the act entitled "An act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes", approved September 1, 1954, so as to limit its application to cases involving the national security; and

S. 196. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1944, Public Law 359, and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 197. A bill to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to States and local communities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 198. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 199. A bill to amend the act pertaining to the establishment of a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the national capital; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 200. A bill providing for control and eradication of the water hyacinth and certain other obnoxious aquatic plant growths;

S. 201. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of salt-marsh and other injurious mosquitoes in the coastal area of southwest Louisiana;

S. 202. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, Louisiana;

S. 203. A bill to provide for the improvement of Fresh Water Bayou, Louisiana;

S. 204. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayou Chevreuil, Louisiana; and

S. 205. A bill to provide for the improvement of the waterway between Barataria Bay, La., and the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. Young):

S. 206. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain feed and seed loans; and

S. 207. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain submarginal lands acquired by the United States in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 208. A bill to prohibit the denial of a deduction as a business expense for compensation paid to a dependent of the taxpayer for personal services actually rendered in the taxpayer's trade or business; and

S. 209. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 210. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, and the portion of Standing Rock Indian Reservation which is located within the boundaries of the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 211. A bill to relieve certain veterans from liability for repayment of amounts erroneously paid to them while members of the Armed Forces;

S. 212. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior;

S. 213. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; and

S. 214. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 215. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay a certain sum for school construction under the provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to Underwood School District No. 8, Underwood, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

S. 216. A bill to provide for exclusion from the mails of mail violating certain State laws dealing with improper solicitations of contributions by charitable organizations and to forbid the payment of money orders therefor;

S. 217. A bill to provide overtime pay for service of postal employees on Saturdays and Sundays during month of December;

S. 218. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes;

S. 219. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers;

S. 220. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for payment of annuities to widowers of female employees, and to surviving children, without regard to dependency; and

S. 221. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 222. A bill to provide for the preservation of acreage history for the purpose of future wheat-acreage allotments where such allotments are underplanted because of unfavorable weather conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;

S. 223. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain land to the city of Spearfish, S. Dak.; and

S. 224. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Fort Randall Dam project, the Oahe Dam project, the Gavins Point Dam project, of mineral, oil, or gas interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 225. A bill for the relief of Kew Chan (Chan Kew), Nancy Tsui Mei (Leung) Chan, and Cecilia (Oi Fan) Chan;

S. 226. A bill for the relief of Earl E. Brown;

S. 227. A bill declaring September 17 a legal public holiday to be known as Constitution Day;

S. 228. A bill for the relief of the Chamberlain Water Co., of Chamberlain, S. Dak.; and

S. 229. A bill to authorize United States attorneys to institute denaturalization proceedings by filing a verified complaint; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 230. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, in order to make certain nonprofit corporations and associations eligible for Federal aid under such title; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 231. A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 232. A bill to require the filing with officials of the Congress of information copies of statements filed with State or Territorial officials with respect to contributions received, or expenditures made, in connection with primaries, conventions, and other processes for the selection of party candidates for election to the Senate or House of Representatives or for the selection of delegates to the national conventions of political parties; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 233. A bill to permit the importation of a trademarked article, without the consent of the owner of the trademark, when such article is for the personal use of the person importing such article; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 234. A bill to amend the definition of the term "Airport development" in the Federal Airport Act, as amended;

S. 235. A bill to increase from \$50 to \$75 per month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service;

S. 236. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of June 20, 1918, as amended, relating to the retirement pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; and

S. 237. A bill to regulate the interstate transportation of lobsters, and to define the term "lobster" for the purpose of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 238. A bill to amend title 3 of the United States Code to provide for the ascertainment of the physical inability of the President to perform the duties of his office and for other purposes;

S. 239. A bill for the relief of Maria Parisi; and

S. 240. A bill for the relief of Cesar William Delgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 241. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Maine, and for other purposes; and

S. 242. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. Ives, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 244. A bill to authorize loans by the Small Business Administration to alleviate unemployment in areas of substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. Ives, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. BUSH):

S. 245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to provide tax relief for small corporations and more equitable tax treatment for persons engaged in small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. Ives, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 246. A bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 247. A bill for the relief of Max Mazak Terian and his wife, Maria Terian;

S. 248. A bill for the relief of Herta Kubelle Shields;

S. 249. A bill for the relief of Theodora Hegeman;

S. 250. A bill for the relief of Kyu Yawp Lee and his wife, Hyung Sook Lee;

S. 251. A bill for the relief of Edith Elisabeth Wagner;

S. 252. A bill for the relief of Katarzyna Siwik;

S. 253. A bill for the relief of Josef Michael Adolf; and

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Susana M. Umanos;

S. 255. A bill for the relief of Fumiko Shikanuki;

S. 256. A bill for the relief of Aristea Vitoglanes; and

S. 257. A bill for the relief of Petronella Elisabeth Deimbeck Major; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 258. A bill for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 259. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; and

S. 260. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 261. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Kautsouradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPEL:

S. 262. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James S. Carpenter;

S. 263. A bill for the relief of the MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., in receivership;

S. 264. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; and

S. 265. A bill for the relief of Jalal Besharat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 266. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. STENNIS, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 267. A bill relating to acreage allotments for the 1957 and subsequent crops of upland cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. STENNIS and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 268. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall return certain mineral interests in land acquired by him for flood-control purposes, to the former owners of such land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 269. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Fischer; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 270. A bill extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 271. A bill for the relief of Johannes Suvevainen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 272. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure payment of the full face value of national service life insurance policies on which payments were commenced prior to September 30, 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 273. A bill to amend section 8 (c) (2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 274. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the arrival of the *Mayflower II* in Plymouth, Mass., during 1957; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 275. A bill to amend section 48 of title 28 of the United States Code in order to authorize holding terms of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit at Miami, Fla.;

S. 276. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Mae Howell;

S. 277. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.;

S. 278. A bill for the relief of Paul Burkhardt;

S. 279. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Arenas Torre;

S. 280. A bill for the relief of Agapito Jorolan;

S. 281. A bill for the relief of Jaffa Kam;

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Quigley;

S. 283. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court;

S. 284. A bill for the relief of Miyako Ueda Osgood;

S. 285. A bill for the relief of Paul Gustin;

S. 286. A bill for the relief of Maria Matilde Picallo;

S. 287. A bill for the relief of Irene Yanez Gonzalez;

S. 288. A bill for the relief of Esther Guagliardo; and

S. 289. A bill for the relief of L. Foster Udell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 290. A bill to provide for the payment of the unpaid balance of joint stock land bank bonds declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States;

S. 291. A bill to provide for payment of the balance due on joint stock land bank bonds declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States;

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Eero Juno Valkonen;

S. 293. A bill for the relief of Donald S. Beckwith;

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion Huggins;

S. 295. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Manesis and George Orphanos;

S. 296. A bill for the relief of Choon Hi Kim;

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian P. Stumm;

S. 298. A bill for the relief of Sorensen Fish Co.; and

S. 299. A bill for the relief of Yi Nyong Suk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 300. A bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 301. A bill to continue the present price-support program for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 302. A bill for the relief of Col. Ernest B. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 303. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Mattioli Cicchini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 304. A bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 305. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands to require competitive bidding for leases of deposits of oil and gas not within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 306. A bill to regulate the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation of passengers by common carriers by water engaged in foreign commerce and in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Noemi Maria Vida Williams; and

S. 308. A bill for the relief of Maria Cacomio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 309. A bill to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code so as further to prohibit former officers and employees of the United States from acting as counsel, attorney, or agent in matters connected with their former office or employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR):

S. 310. A bill to establish procedure to be followed by Secretaries of the military departments for adjustment or settlement of claims of less than \$2,500 resulting from United States acquisition of land; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 311. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the channel leading from Indian River Bay to Assawoman Canal known as White's Creek, Del.; and

S. 312. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the channel leading from Indian River Bay via Pepper's Creek to Dagsboro, Del.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. THYE, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. PORTELL, and Mr. IVES):

S. 313. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 314. A bill to assist the United States cotton-textile industry in regaining its equitable share of the world market; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 315. A bill to provide for the purchase by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of certain radiological detection instruments, devices, and equipment, and the leasing thereof to the States for civil-defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 316. A bill to provide for stating appropriations on an accrued-expenditure basis; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 317. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healey Act); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 318. A bill to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 319. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 320. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for the designation of a certain portion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ruff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 322. A bill to amend section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for nonrecognition of gain if property held for productive use or for investment is compulsorily or involuntarily converted into property of a like kind to be held for productive use or for investment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 323. A bill to amend section 334 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to increased allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 324. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 325. A bill to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 326. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 327. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the State of Montana to Theresa Brost;

S. 328. A bill to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 329. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes;

S. 330. A bill to declare that the United States hold certain lands in trust for the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of Montana; and

S. 331. A bill to amend the act entitled "To confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 332. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 333. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 334. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Tokuhata; and

S. 336. A bill for the relief of Angela Ferini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. STENNIS,

Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. EVIN, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SCHOEPPLE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JENNER, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 337. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 338. A bill to authorize modification of existing project for the Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 339. A bill to establish recreational use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive study of national forest recreational use needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 340. A bill to amend section 4 (c) of the act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1044), relating to the construction of small reclamation projects;

S. 341. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1954, on termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 342. A bill to implement the 10-year Mission 66 plan that has been undertaken for the public benefit concerning the rehabilitation, improvement, and preservation of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 343. A bill to authorize the admission to the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

S. 344. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes;

S. 345. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders, and for other purposes; and

S. 346. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 347. A bill to authorize modification of existing project for the Siuslaw River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the payment of the estate tax in installments;

S. 349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain corporations to elect to be taxed as partnerships;

S. 350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the proprietor of an unincorporated business to be treated as an employee under a qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock-bonus plan;

S. 351. A bill to amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of certain methods and rates of depreciation for used property acquired after 1956; and

S. 352. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 353. A bill for the relief of George A. Zizicas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 354. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of aiding small- and medium-sized business, encouraging industrial expansion, encouraging competition, counteracting forces growing out of the present tax structure which are bringing about widespread corporate mergers and consolidations, and for the purpose of discouraging the growing concentration of business into a few giant corporations, by substituting for the nearly uniform tax rates now applicable to corporations of vastly differing sizes a moderate graduation of tax rates on corporate incomes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 355. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia;

S. 356. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia" so as to provide for the appointment of a referee; and

S. 357. A bill to amend section 7 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 358. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the State of Wyoming of about 37.75 acres of land comprising a part of Francis E. Warren Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 359. A bill to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of lands which, in

the case of an one entryman, form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 360. A bill to amend section 2 (d) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to increase the maximum amount which a recipient of disability benefits under such act may receive as earnings from employment or self-employment to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution designating the Saturday before Palm Sunday in each year as Crippled Children's Day; and

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the period from February 12, 1957, to February 19, 1957, as National Negro History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument in the city of Decatur, Ill., to the memory of, and in honor of, the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG:

S. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prescribing the term of office of members of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a temporary commission to investigate highway traffic safety conditions; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowstone Dam and Reservoir, Hardin Unit, Missouri River Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1957, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study and propose improvements in the methods of nominating and electing the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE:

S. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

BASIC WORKWEEK FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for employees of the Government. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2) to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for employees of the Government, introduced by Mr. PURTELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement, presented by Mr. PURTELL, is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PURTELL

I have today introduced for appropriate reference a bill providing for a 35-hour workweek for Federal Government employees. My purpose is primarily exploratory. I believe Senate hearings on the proposed legislation will develop much valuable information as to the shorter workweek not only for Federal Government employees but for the Nation's work force in general. Such a study, I hope, will be all-inclusive and will extend to a review of the possibilities of making the wage-and-hour law more flexible and practical as to overtime provisions in the event the 35-hour workweek becomes a general reality. Obviously there are great ramifications attendant upon a shorter workweek and we must study and understand them and their impact on our economy. When all the facts are ascertained, as I hope they will be, we will be able to act on information reflecting the true picture in its effect on business, industry, and labor throughout our Nation. I trust the bill will result in a pilot study which will in itself be a most valuable service.

I know I have been and will be criticized by some people, but not by those who really understand my objective and who appreciate the great problems which lay before us. Changing social and economic conditions seem certain to bring about a shorter workweek, not necessarily this year or next year, but inevitably. Why then should we fear facing the facts? Why should we turn our

backs to the future? Why not explore, understand and intelligently prepare for the absorption into our economic structure of such inevitable changes?

It is true that today we have approximately 65 million employed and there are relatively few areas of under employment. This is particularly so in my State of Connecticut. But we must look beyond the present.

It is also true that more than one-half of our national budget today must be spent for defense. Millions are employed directly or indirectly as a result of defense spending, but certainly our future is not predicated upon forever being thus engaged. Surely we hope and believe the time will come when our defense needs lessen and a substantial portion of the labor force now so engaged will be channeled into consumer goods production. Our population is increasing rapidly—some estimate the 1970 population of our country as high as 200 million people. Millions are entering our work force yearly and their number will increase. The individual life span has been lengthened and will be lengthened further. Also while it is probably true that, today in our defense activity, middle age is not a particular deterrent to gaining employment, this has not always been true nor will it probably be true in a peacetime economy unless we so provide.

There should be, there must be, a continuing place in our work force for those over 45 or 50 or 55 or 60 years of age, able, willing and ready to work. A perusal of the help-wanted columns particularly in metropolitan papers even today clearly indicates the age limitation placed upon job opportunities.

As an industrial nation, we have developed a highly interdependent society. With continuing advances in mechanization, in automation, we shall be even more interdependent. Let us, then, look ahead and prepare to meet intelligently the changing social and economic needs of our people and our Nation.

A workweek of fewer than 40 hours is neither novel nor new. Most Connecticut State employees work a 35-hour week. This is generally true also of Rhode Island and New Jersey. At least 20 of the States and Territories have less than a 40-hour workweek. In Connecticut, the insurance companies work an average week of a little over 36 hours.

In many metropolitan areas the printing industry has reduced the workweek below 40 hours and the reduction is spreading throughout the industry. In the construction field, more than 10 percent of union tradesmen have a standard 7-hour day in major cities. In Akron, Ohio, the rubber industry has been on a 36-hour week for more than 20 years. Schedules of less than 40 hours have been in effect in some areas of the country, in lumbering, millinery, jewelry, coal mining, retailing, fur, motion pictures. A large portion of clerical employees and other office workers are on schedules of less than 40 hours a week in many areas. More than 95 percent of the organized lady garment workers are now working under agreements providing for a 35-hour week at the present time or before the expiration of present contracts.

The objective of the proposed study is not to find out how to maintain the present work schedules and to encourage the payment of overtime for all hours worked in excess of 35. The objective is to examine the question of a 35-hour workweek schedule for Federal Government employees. In the process of doing so, I hope, will be produced much helpful information on how such a shortened schedule may be generally adopted in all fields when economic and social needs require it.

What is wrong with exploring this whole matter so that the Nation may gear itself to changing conditions and to prepare itself to meet such changes without weakening our economic structure?

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT OF WEBER BASIN, UTAH, FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3) to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS,) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

I am reintroducing a bill for myself and Senator WATKINS which would authorize flood control improvements along the Weber and Ogden Rivers in Utah. An identical bill, S. 722, which I offered in 1955 was included in the Omnibus Public Works bill, H. R. 12080, as it passed the Senate and House in 1956 and was also approved by all of the executive agencies including the Bureau of the Budget. Unfortunately other projects which had not been investigated by the Bureau of the Budget were included in H. R. 12080 and it was therefore vetoed by the President.

NEED FOR THE PROJECT

The year 1952 saw a severe flood pour down the Weber and Ogden Rivers inundating and severely damaging 1,200 acres of key residential, business, industrial and manufacturing property in the city of Ogden, while at the same time washing out one transcontinental highway artery in several places and flooding another, as well as flooding strategic railroads and the Ogden railroad yards. Twenty thousand acres of improved agricultural lands were damaged and 100 acres of important residential and business land in Morgan were flooded.

The Corps of Engineers estimates, I believe conservatively, that unless protective measures are taken, flood damage will average \$264,000 each year.

NATURE OF THE PROJECT

The Army Corps of Engineers proposes in the flood control plan to operate several existing and authorized projects for flood control including Echo, Wanship, Pineview, Lost Creek and East Canyon Creek reservoirs as well as the Willare Bay diversion canal. I have been assured that the present contemplated uses of these structures will not be jeopardized or harmed in any way by operating them for flood control purposes together with their original purposes.

Channel improvements will be made where necessary on the Weber River between Morgan and the mouth of the Ogden River. These improvements will consist of about 5 miles of low disconnected levees; rock revetment where required to prevent bank erosion; about 12 miles of clearing and snagging; and channel enlargement in Ogden by raising the banks, removing the Hooper and Plain City diversion dams, and deepening the channel after removal of the dams.

The plan will afford protection from floods downstream from the Echo reservoir on the Weber River, and from Pineview reservoir on the Ogden River from all floods with an in-

dicated frequency of occurrence of once in 50 years in rural areas and once in 100 years in urban areas.

COST OF THE PROJECT

The estimated first cost of the channel improvements is \$635,000 of which \$500,000 would be provided by the Federal Government and \$135,000 by the local interests. The estimated charges after completion will be \$40,000, of which \$15,800 is Federal and \$24,200 will be locally provided.

This cost is more than justified when compared to the estimated annual benefits from the project of \$242,000, particularly when it is realized that the 1952 flood causing better than \$1,600,000 in damages would have been largely prevented if this project had been in existence.

LOCAL COOPERATION PLEDGED

Both Weber and Morgan Counties which are principally involved in this project have pledged their fullest cooperation in assuming the local portions of the project operation and cost. The State of Utah wholeheartedly supports the project, feeling that nothing but good can come from its approval. The only reservation the State had concerned the fear that fishing might be damaged. However, the Corps of Engineers has assured the State that developments on the project will be coordinated with the Utah Fish and Game Commission so as to minimize any harmful effects the construction may have on the fishery resources, so the only problem has been removed.

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

A survey of the Bonneville Basin was authorized in 1938 and included the Weber and Ogden Rivers. A report was completed by the Army Corps of Engineers in June of 1954, and I introduced a bill, S. 3607, embodying the Corps' recommendations. Unfortunately, it was too late for the bill to be included in the omnibus flood control bill of 1954, since the final report by the Corps was not submitted to Congress until May 9, 1955.

In January of 1955, at the beginning of the new Congress, I reintroduced my bill, now S. 722, which was followed by H. R. 4262 introduced by Congressman Dixon in February of the same year.

BILLS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, seven bills.

The first, entitled, "A bill to prevent the service or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial passenger aircraft and military aircraft," received strong support from all areas of the country during the 2d session of the 84th Congress. I deem this proposed legislation to be of vital importance to the safety and well-being of all Americans who travel the airways and those on the ground who may be subjected to the tragedy of an air crash caused by the actions of some berserk passenger under the influence of alcoholic beverages. I hope this bill will receive prompt attention by the committee to which it is referred so that hearings can be held in the Senate for the purpose of presenting the real facts about the dangers inherent in the continuation of the practice of serving intoxicating beverages aboard commercial and military aircraft.

The second bill I introduce is entitled, "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to prevent the allocation

of procurement contracts to certain designated geographical areas, and for other purposes." The purpose of this proposed legislation, Mr. President, is to curb the practice of channeling Government procurement contracts to preferential areas of the country at the expense of other areas where manufacturers are capable of providing the same goods and services at lower cost to the Government and American taxpayers. This totally unfair method of awarding Government contracts has resulted in gross inequities under both administrations. At one time, the Office of Defense Mobilization had authorized set-asides of as much as 50 percent and I protested against this. But, during the 84th Congress, I discovered that Dr. Arthur Flemming had authorized a 100 percent procurement set aside for a labor-surplus area. This order excluded all plants outside this particular area from presenting any bids whatsoever, thereby knocking from contention a plant in Greenville, S. C., which specialized in that type product and which could have undertaken these contracts at a low cost to the Government. I have written to Dr. Flemming protesting this type of action, but I have received no satisfaction from his replies. Thus, legislation is necessary to bring about a reversal of this discriminatory policy by administrative decree.

The third bill I introduce for appropriate reference is entitled "A bill to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies or instrumentalities." This bill is designed specifically to prohibit contractors negotiating contracts with the Federal Government from gaining immunity from State and local sales taxes on their purchases used in fulfilling these obligations. Too many revenue sources have already been closed to the States. This is clearly one area in which the taxing power of the State should not be denied under the guise of Federal immunity.

I introduce another bill entitled, "A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a laboratory for a study of the utilization of the soil and water resources of the southeastern United States." This great agricultural area of our country has been struck by serious droughts during the past few years and also by adverse weather conditions resulting in increased soil erosion. This proposed legislation is needed to aid our conservationists in discovering better practices for preserving both our valuable soil and water resources.

The fifth bill I introduce is entitled "A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C." I hope this bill will receive early consideration by the Congress, as its passage is vital to the operation of the new Bowater Paper Mill near Rock Hill. The Catawba Indian leaders have agreed to the acquisition of certain land by the city of Rock Hill for the purpose of erecting a sewerage-treatment plant for this new and important industry in that community.

Another bill which I introduce for appropriate reference is entitled, "A bill to

deny tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to any organization which engages in the promotion of litigation to which it is not a party." This bill is designed to plug another loophole in our tax laws which permits organizations to spend tax-free money to promote litigation to which such organizations are not a party.

Finally, I send to the desk and introduce, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina] and myself, a bill entitled, "A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to provide for participation by tobacco producers in the acreage-reserve program on the basis of 1956 acreage allotments." Many of our tobacco farmers are facing economic collapse as a result of continuous slashes in tobacco acreage quotas. We propose this legislation in an effort to provide these farmers with a small benefit which may mean enough to many of them to keep them in America's greatest and most vital business—that of farming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 4. A bill to prevent the service or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial passenger aircraft and military aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to prevent the allocation of procurement contracts to certain designated geographical areas, and for other purposes; and

S. 6. A bill to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies or instrumentalities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 7. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a laboratory for a study of the utilization of the soil and water resources of the southeastern United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 8. A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 9. A bill to deny tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to any organization which engages in the promotion of litigation to which it is not a party; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 10. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to provide for participation by tobacco producers in the acreage-reserve program on the basis of 1956 acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT RELATING TO EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and several colleagues, I am reintroducing today the bill to amend the Robinson-Patman Act, the so-called equality of opportunity bill, which is designed to give small business an opportunity to compete fairly with big business. I ask, Mr. President, that after receiving a number, this bill remain upon the desk 1 week for the addition of the names of any other Senators who might wish to join in its sponsorship.

In the last session, this bill passed the House by a vote of 393 to 3. It was caught, however, in the closing days of the Senate when unanimous consent was required to bring up a bill, and was never given Senate consideration.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act and a life-long friend of small business, has reintroduced an identical bill in the House.

Mr. President, this bill is designed to close a loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act. The loophole is the so-called good-faith defense, which permits any price discrimination, regardless of its effect upon competition, so long as it is made in good faith.

The burden is upon enforcement agencies to prove the discrimination was not in good faith—which is extremely difficult as a practical matter.

The loophole stemmed from the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Standard Oil of Indiana* case (340 U. S. 231). In that decision the Court held that good faith is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act.

The Robinson-Patman Act was intended merely to give all business, large and small, an equal opportunity in the competitive race for survival. At the time of its enactment in 1935, small business was being driven to the wall. Large buyers were obtaining price concessions which enabled them to sell at prices the small merchants, regardless of their efficiency, could not possibly meet.

In passing the Robinson-Patman Act, Congress sought to remedy this situation. The rule underlying the new law was a simple one. A seller must not discriminate in price where such discriminations are not justified by differences in cost of servicing different customers and where the effect of such unjustified discriminations may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

The essence of the Court's decision in the *Standard Oil* case is that wherever the FTC challenges a discriminatory practice, and the supplier pleads that he has carried on that practice in good faith, the Government is stopped from issuing a cease and desist order, and the supplier is free to continue the practice, regardless of its effect on competition.

The bill which we are introducing today would go a long way toward attaining the objectives which the authors of the Robinson-Patman Act thought they had secured when the act was passed originally. Under it good faith would not be a complete defense, where probably the effect of the discrimination is to injure competition; but, where the discrimination is of lesser dimensions, good faith would still be a complete defense.

We seek no special favors for small business. We seek merely to preserve the free competitive system. The enactment of this bill, which has now had a legislative history of some 8 years, would go a long way toward protecting that free competitive system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for the addition of the names of other sponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED MONTHLY WARTIME RATES OF COMPENSATION PAYABLE TO SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be held at the desk for 2 days so that other Senators may avail themselves of the opportunity to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 39) to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans, introduced by Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. MURRAY) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DEATH PENSION PAYABLE TO WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF CERTAIN DECEASED VETERANS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 2 days to enable Senators who wish to cosponsor it to add their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 40) to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict, introduced by Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LONG, and Mr. YOUNG) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SAN ANGELO RECLAMATION PROJECT, TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, two particularly crucial problems face this new Congress: the crisis in foreign affairs and the great drought of the Southwest. On Saturday we heard the President's foreign policy proposals. Later this month the President will begin his trip into Texas and other States to appraise the economic and human damage that has been done during a catastrophic drought.

The Senate will soon apply itself to the President's foreign policy proposals. Today I should like to comment on another crisis facing our Nation—the drought.

This drought in the Southwestern States has been going on now for 7 or 8 years. It is the worst, in severity and duration, which my State has ever suffered.

But even if we should have more than adequate rainfall for the next 12 months; even if the Federal Government responds to the great need for drought relief, the problem will remain. In Texas—even when rainfall is adequate—we are continually plagued by two dilemmas: too much rain in the wrong places; the threat of flash floods and these agonizing, interminable periods of drought.

West Texas is particularly susceptible to these harassments. When it does rain in this region, it overflows the arroyos and riverbeds, threatening property, life, and devastating the land. Moreover, rain is of little benefit when 80 percent of these waters flow unused into the Gulf of Mexico.

And when there is no rain, of course, farmlands lie useless and public water supplies are imperiled.

I am introducing today a bill, providing for the construction of a reclamation project near San Angelo, Tex., which is designed to meet both the flood-control and water-supply problems in this area. This identical project was approved by the Senate in the closing days of the 84th Congress. The only difference between last year's bill and this one, is that the crisis which the project is designed to relieve has become even more severe.

The major features of this project are Twin Buttes Dam and Reservoir, which will impound the waters of the Middle and South Concho Rivers to a capacity of 810,000 acre-feet, and a complete irrigation system providing water for 10,000 acres of land downstream from San Angelo.

Senators who have traveled in the West during the past year do not need my words to convince them of the gravity of the water problem there. I earnestly hope the distinguished Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will turn its attention to this project with all sympathy and dispatch.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 42) to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other

purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have the honor to introduce, on my own behalf and that of a number of other Senators of both political parties, bills to admit the strategic American Territories of Hawaii and Alaska as States of the United States. Appropriately, I have asked that the symbolic numbers 49 and 50 be assigned to these measures.

The two bills I am sending forward for appropriate reference differ from the statehood bills of previous years in that they are proposed acts of admission, as distinct from enabling acts. That is, S. 49 and S. 50 recognize the fact that both Alaska and Hawaii already have adopted State constitutions. The bills would give approval to these constitutions under proper safeguards. They would authorize the people of the Territories to elect congressional and State officers in the general elections of 1958, and thereafter be admitted as States.

Thus, the Alaska bill does not call for the immediate seating in the Senate of the two distinguished citizens of Alaska who were elected as "provisional United States Senators," so to speak, last fall. It is my present belief that the Members of the Senate well may wish to consider that question separately.

Mr. President, I desire to explain why this year statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is being proposed in separate bills, rather than in a single joint bill, as in the 83d and 84th Congresses. Frankly, this procedure is at the request of the duly elected Delegates of both Territories, and, as nearly as can be ascertained, is in accord with the wishes of a majority of the citizens of both Territories.

Separate bills in no way reflect any change whatsoever in my belief and that of the other sponsors of the measures that both Alaska and Hawaii are equally ready for statehood, and that both should be accorded equal treatment by the Congress and by the administration. We have been assured that the President will carry out the provisions of his party's platform this year in respect to Alaska, as well as to Hawaii, and give the administration's support to both, equally.

I want to give the Senate my solemn assurance that we will insist upon such equality of treatment when it comes to legislative action.

A majority of the continuing members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of both parties have indicated their intention to give prompt attention to the statehood bills, and it is my hope we can bring these measures before this body very early in the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, for himself and other Senators, were received, read twice by their titles, and

referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 49. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union; and

S. 50. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS OF CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for myself and Senators ALLOTT, BARRETT, BEALL, BENNETT, BRICKER, BUSH, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, COTTON, DWORSHAK, FLANDERS, HRUSKA, IVES, JENNER, KNOWLAND, KUCHEL, LANGER, MARTIN of Iowa, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, PAYNE, POTTER, PURTELL, SALTONSTALL, SMITH of New Jersey, THYE, WATKINS, REVERCOMB, SCHOEPEL, and WILEY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be held at the desk for 2 days to enable other Senators to add their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 83) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPERIMENTAL SEARCH PROGRAM AND CLOUD MODIFICATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to be known as the Defense Cloud Modification Act of 1957.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 84) to be known as the Defense Cloud Modification Act of 1957, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, every Member of Congress is interested in the studies being made by the Advisory Committee on Weather Control. Capt. Howard T. Orville, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control and consultant to Friez instrument division, Bendix Aviation Corp., on the 10th of December 1956 delivered an address on that subject before the national convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at Miami, Fla. The address is entitled, "What Every Farmer Should Know About Weather Modification (Cloud Seeding)."

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD, and I commend it to the reading of all who are interested in the subject.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE FARMER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT WEATHER MODIFICATION (CLOUD SEEDING)

(By Howard T. Orville, chairman, Advisory Committee on Weather Control and consultant to Friez instrument division, Bendix Aviation Corp.)

Recent reports received from the United States Department of Agriculture tell us that we are now experiencing one of the worst drought conditions in history. Twelve States comprising a total of over 500 counties, or parts of counties, have been declared disaster areas in connection with the hay and feed program. More than 600 counties, or parts of counties, in 12 States have been declared disaster areas as far as the soil-bank acreage reserve grazing program is concerned and more than 400 counties or parts of counties in 7 States have been declared disaster areas insofar as hay and feed for livestock are concerned. In all of these areas the serious water shortage has directed attention to the urgent need for supplementing present sources of water by every possible method known to man. One method which has been given wide publicity over the last 10 years is known as weather modification or cloud seeding.

Almost 10 years ago to the day 2 scientists, Dr. Irving Langmuir, a Nobel prize winner, and his assistant, Dr. Vincent Schaefer, succeeded in creating a snowstorm by dropping dry ice pellets from an aircraft into a supercooled cumulus cloud (a cloud having the appearance of a pack of wool and drifting along in temperatures well below freezing).

This successful flight was the culmination of some 5 or 6 years of exhaustive research at Mount Washington, N. H., and at the General Electric Laboratories at Schenectady. This historic flight probably represents the first time that man successfully modified the weather using accepted scientific methods and had created additional precipitation, although the amount was very small. However, the results of these experiments were so dramatic and aroused such widespread interest that it was not long before commercial cloud-seeding companies, World War II pilots, and many others were exploiting for personal gain these initial successful experiments. During the next 4 years, 1946-50, there were many newspaper accounts of almost phenomenal increases in rain or snowfall caused by artificial seeding of the clouds with dry ice or silver iodide, a chemical which has essentially the same crystalline structure as ice particles. Dr. Vonnegut, an associate of Dr. Langmuir and Dr. Schaefer, is credited with discovering that silver iodide may be used to milk the clouds of their moisture.

Unfortunately, these fantastic claims did not produce the water which was needed so badly in many of the Western States, and the farmers soon became very, very critical of any rainmaker who offered to seed the clouds and produce more rain over his farm. This is understandable, because in 1951-52 almost 20 percent of the total area of the United States was a target area for rain-making operations. Many of these operations were being conducted by people who had little or no knowledge of the scientific aspects of weather modification and were endeavoring to make a quick fortune out of the poor farmers who were struggling to survive under terrific handicaps.

It is not surprising that Members of Congress became alarmed when their constituents from the farmlands and other areas experiencing water shortages informed them that the new methods of rain increasing were not producing the results claimed by the

cloud-seeding companies. Others reported flood damage which they attributed to cloud-seeding operations.

This situation led Congress to start a series of investigations. Several bills were introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Exhaustive hearings were held in which a large number of persons from every walk of life were asked to appear before the congressional committees to give their opinion as to the effectiveness of cloud-seeding experiments. After more than 2 years of hearings, a bipartisan bill was passed. This bill was originated by Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, and sponsored by Senator Clinton Anderson, of New Mexico; Senator Warren Magnuson, of Washington; Senator Arthur Watkins, of Utah; and Senator Guy Gordon, of Oregon. President Eisenhower signed the bill on August 13, 1953. This became Public Law 256, which created the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, an 11-man committee consisting of 5 members from private life of recognized standing in business, science, and agriculture, and 6 Cabinet members (or their designees) of interested Government departments. This committee held its first meeting 9 days after the appointment by the President of the 5 members from private life. At its first meeting the committee adopted 4 guiding principles which are quoted below:

"First, the committee will base its conclusions on facts obtained and interpreted and not any preconceived notions. Experiments to date have suggested that weather control may eventually provide benefits to agriculture, industry, and Government. Without such a hint of substantial benefits, the Congress would most likely not have created this committee. However, the committee will not now proceed under the assumption that weather control, including rainmaking, does 'work' or does not 'work.' It will aim to examine all of the evidence with scholarly care and scientific impartiality.

"Second, the committee recognizes the need for additional basic research dealing with processes related to rain, snow, and cloud phenomena. There is also the need to develop ways and means of providing methods for reliable evaluation of weather-control activities. The committee will encourage such research in industry, at our universities, and throughout Government.

"Third, the committee will welcome, and will solicit, the information possessed by and the opinions held by all individuals and groups having an interest in the field of weather control. It will carefully consider all facts and opinions pertinent to its study.

"Fourth, the committee will not act in any way prejudicial to responsible individuals and concerns attempting to modify the weather."

The committee has endeavored to carry out an impartial evaluation of commercial cloud-seeding operations in spite of technical and political prejudices and many sinister influences which have attempted to contaminate the findings to suit their own personal interests.

During the 3 years that the committee has been in existence it has held 14 meetings, has traveled over 150,000 miles throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands visiting field operations and talking to cloud seeders and their clients, consulted with or sought the advice of more than 100 prominent scientists familiar with one aspect or another of cloud physics or weather modification. It has reviewed innumerable technical documents covering the results of domestic or foreign cloud-seeding experiments. By January 1955 the committee had assembled a technical staff which developed a two-phase evaluation program. One phase dealt with the

rainfall data and statistical treatment to determine by well-known statistical methods whether the rainfall data measured over areas which had been seeded could detect any increase over that which would have occurred from natural causes. The other phase consisted of a physical evaluation program to determine whether the field methods used by the commercial cloud-seeding companies were valid. This overall evaluation program has been developed extensively in the past 2 years and one interim report has been submitted to President Eisenhower.

This report shows that, in spite of many difficulties, including defective instruments, great scarcity of or total lack of rainfall data and many other obstacles too numerous to mention, it was possible for the committee's technical staff to develop a methodology which, when applied to 6 west-coast projects, produced average increases of 9 to 17 percent over the expected precipitation in these States. Mountainous areas favor the forced ascent of cloud-seeding material into the deep cool moist storms characteristic of the late winter and early spring months. Of these 6 projects that have been operating continuously for a period of 3 to 5 years, 5 of them produced the increases quoted above, the sixth project was inconclusive.

In its report the committee emphasized that the results obtained in California, Oregon, and Washington could not be extrapolated to other States or other areas. There are 24 of the 48 States which have mountainous areas that favor positive results. The other States comprise those States in the Mississippi Valley, the Gulf region, and the Great Plains and have shown inconclusive results for one reason or another or they have not yet been evaluated. This does not mean that cloud seeding is ineffective in these areas. This is the task which the committee will tackle during the next 2 years of its existence, to July 30, 1958.

It is of interest to note the economic benefits which might accrue to many areas receiving additional rain during the growing season. Senator CASE, of South Dakota, reported on January 12, 1956, "When the Congress first considered making appropriations to get this work underway, I told one of the committees of the Senate that:

"If the advisory committee finds that weather modification experiments cannot produce important results, it will so report and thus deter farmers and ranchers from spending their money unwisely. This will, if such a report has to be made, save the public millions of dollars.

"If the advisory committee finds that weather modification activities work only in certain circumstances, it will find out what those circumstances are and thus encourage feasible projects and discourage those which are not feasible.

"If the advisory committee finds out it can confirm the results claimed by the reports it has so far received from reputable and scientifically competent operators—increases of from 7 to 50 percent and more—then the dollar benefits to agriculture, industry, and Government will be so great as to be incalculable."

"In other words, I said at that time, whatever the committee reported, this would produce tangible and real economic benefits to the water users of this Nation."

And in the same remarks, "I can reasonably and conservatively estimate that precipitation increases of the magnitude indicated (9 percent to 17 percent by the committee) could produce average annual benefits of \$20 million and quite possibly up to \$50 million in these States."

In quoting further, Senator CASE has stated, "I hope that farmers, ranchers, and other water users will continue to sponsor cloud-seeding projects, keeping in mind the uncertainty of results in some areas but also the importance of the benefits compared to the relatively small cost if the seeding suc-

ceeds. They should probably insist on more careful scientific design of these projects and should probably introduce greater permanency in the projects so as to make evaluation feasible."

The committee is watching closely extensive cloud-seeding projects which are being carried out in foreign countries, especially Australia, Japan, France, Switzerland, Spain, Israel, and Pakistan. At least 40 other countries have recently or are presently conducting some form of research using the scientific methods first proposed by Doctors Langmuir and Schaefer.

Another phase of the weather modification program which is of interest to those of you who are from the Midwestern States is the possibility of hail abatement.

As many of you well know, hailstorms cause extensive damage to crops, especially wheat and corn acreage in Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, and Iowa. Fruit, especially apples, peaches, apricots, grapes, and plums, are easily damaged by hailstorms. Because of its broad leaves tobacco is particularly susceptible to hail damage. It has been reported that North Carolina has annual hail losses to its tobacco crop exceeding \$3 million.

Destructive hailstorms have caused great damage in the Midwestern States. In 1951 hail damage amounted to \$31,300,000 in the State of Kansas alone. The other Midwest States have also experienced some very destructive hailstorms. The largest hailstone ever officially recorded fell on Potter, Nebr., in 1928. Some of these hailstones measured 4½ inches to 5½ inches in diameter and the largest was 17 inches in circumference and weighed 24 ounces or 1½ pounds. In Lubbock, Tex., in 1930 a farmer was caught in an unprotected field and was wounded to death by these stones. However, this was an exceptional case.

Scientists have informed the committee that cloud seeding techniques may very well be used to suppress hail. They tell us that by seeding potential hail producing thunderstorms early enough it may cause the rain to start much earlier in many small drops and that the storm will dissipate before it ever reaches hail-producing proportions.

Last summer the committee was watching closely attempts to suppress hail in Scottsbluff, Nebr., Hudson Valley, N. Y., Wenatchee, Wash., and one or two other fruit-growing areas in Oregon and California. The reports of the success or failure of these projects have not yet been received in committee headquarters.

Hail suppression cloud-seeding operations require the use of a great number of silver iodide generators which are placed around and up-wind of the target area. When reports of impending thunderstorms are received the generators are automatically turned on and operate continuously until the threat of hail has passed. In some cases airplanes are also used to supplement the ground generators. In a few cases radar, the "magic eye" of electronics, is used to observe the effects of cloud seeding.

The committee has also been informed that the same techniques for suppressing hail should reduce the frequency of lightning strikes. If this is true then it is of utmost importance to reduce fire losses caused by lightning strikes in our national forests. Last spring damaging forest fires were experienced in Arizona and New Mexico. The United States Forest Service reported that 85 percent of these fires were caused by lightning strikes. Seventy-five percent of all forest fires in the Western States are caused by lightning. The cost of fighting forest fires exceeds \$100 million annually.

As a result of initial success in cloud-seeding efforts there have been many inquiries covering a wide variety of problems, some of them are mentioned briefly below. Many unscrupulous individuals and outright

quacks have attempted to sell cartridges and rockets supposedly filled with silver iodide or dry ice. Other charlatans have attempted to sell farmers electrical devices of various types which they claim will bring rainfall. All of these methods are fraudulent and persons known to be selling such products should be prosecuted. The county agricultural agent or the better business bureau can advise farmers whether or not a commercial cloud-seeding company uses scientific methods.

The question of "robbing Peter to pay Paul" has been asked repeatedly. Some individuals in Midwestern States believe that cloud seeding on the west coast has robbed them of precipitation which they would otherwise get were it not for the seeding. Others maintain that seeding clouds up-wind a few miles will rob them of rain which they would normally get. The best scientific opinion today indicates that present cloud seeding techniques will remove not more than 5 percent of the potential amount of moisture in a cloud and that even including the rain which would fall naturally probably more than 90 percent of the total moisture in a cloud moves on down-wind. So there appears to be little likelihood that in the overall picture cloud seeding takes moisture away from farmers down-wind from the target area.

Since cloud seeding operations cost only 2 cents to 18 cents an acre, depending upon the type of crop and soil, the cost-benefit ratio is so great, 1 to 20 or better especially during the growing season, many farmers have told the committee that the risk is well worth the money it costs to employ cloud-seeding companies. Others have indicated that many of the "calculated" risks that they take daily are much greater than those experienced with cloud seeding. Current estimates today are that the annual gross income from cloud seeding is \$3 million to \$5 million.

Cloud seeding to increase precipitation or for hail or lightning suppression is in its infancy. Much remains to be learned about the precipitation processes. Rain, snow, hail, and lightning occur under natural processes which are imperfectly understood today by our best informed scientists. Our ignorance level of the precipitation processes is extremely high. This means that our efforts should be devoted to conducting field experiments under controlled conditions with highly qualified scientists supervising the cloud-seeding operations.

Farmers should seek advice from their respective water resources agencies, State universities, or agricultural agents before entering into any contract with commercial cloud-seeding companies. There are a few very reliable companies, but there are also many individuals who are quacks and who are attempting to capitalize on the small knowledge which has been gained recently by scientific cloud seeding experiments.

It is of interest to summarize the results of the committee's evaluation program to date. It has found:

1. That supercooled stratified clouds can be dissipated by aircraft seeding with dry ice or silver iodide.
2. That precipitation can be initiated by seeding warm cumulus clouds with water.
3. That dry ice and silver iodide seeding of cumulus clouds extending to 5,000 feet or more above the freezing line and with a temperature at the top of the cloud of -10° centigrade will induce precipitation.
4. That ground generator seeding with silver iodide in the three Pacific coast States has produced average increases of 9 percent to 17 percent under the conditions mentioned in an earlier paragraph.
5. That an intensive study of hail prevention and the possibility of reducing lightning seems well justified. Many destructive forest fires in the Western States are started

by lightning strikes. It is believed that cloud seeding will start the precipitation process earlier and will prevent the storms from building up to hail and lightning-producing proportions. Much more study of this problem must be made before any final conclusions can be drawn.

6. That Federal regulation of rain-increasing operations is not justified at this time.

7. That continued controlled experimentation holds promise of developing new techniques which may be of greatest economic importance to the farmer.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE AND NATIONAL HOUSING ACTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, two bills which I hope will be more effective than the verbal protests many of us have made against the proposed raising of the 4½-percent GI home loan interest rate. These bills would provide a renewed flow of investment money into the sagging GI home loan market. They are companions to proposed legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

These bills, if passed, would mean a saving to prospective veteran home purchasers of half a billion dollars in interest charges.

To put it very simply, they would save the average veteran who purchases a \$14,000 GI home about \$5 every month for 30 years because that is what it would cost the veteran in additional interest payments if he were required to pay 5 percent for his mortgage loan.

These measures provide that up to \$3 billion shall be made available to purchase VA-guaranteed GI home mortgages at par. They would also reestablish the section of the Housing Act of 1950 which gave the VA authority to prohibit discounting of VA underwritten mortgages—a section which was repealed by the Republican 83d Congress.

Mr. President, I was shocked and dismayed during my travels around the country during the past year, to discover the alarming discounts which home builders and sellers of GI homes are being forced to pay lending and financial interests in order to place a GI mortgage, many of them running as high as \$600 on an \$11,000 house and in some areas even higher.

Under the proposed GI mortgage assistance bill, the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized and directed to invest up to 25 percent of the National Service Life Insurance premium reserves in VA guaranteed GI mortgages at their par value. Since the NSLI fund at present totals more than \$5.5 billion, this will provide more than \$1 billion to support GI home financing at the present ceiling interest rate of 4½ percent. The proposals also provide for supplementary financing, if that should be needed. This includes earmarking \$1 billion of FNMA special assistance funds to be used immediately for purchases and advance commitments to purchase GI mortgages at par, and authority for the President to activate an additional billion dollars for such special assistance purchases, if

necessary to carry out the objectives of the bills.

Mr. President, let me emphasize that the NSLI is guaranteed against any loss by provisions in the bills which require that any GI loan acquired by the fund which defaults shall be refunded or purchased directly by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. NSLI funds are already being invested in special issues of Treasury notes which yield a return of 3 percent. These proposals would give holders of NSLI policies the possibility of either lower insurance premiums or higher NSLI dividends.

The scandalous and exorbitant discounting practices which are being permitted since the administration persuaded the Congress in 1954 to repeal the 1950 prohibition should be stopped. I vividly recall the administration's 1953 argument that if the interest rates could only be raised to 4½ percent on GI and FHA mortgages, there would be enough mortgage funds activated so that discounting would no longer be a serious question.

Congress repealed the provision against discounting in the Housing Act of 1954, and look what we have—discounts up to 10 points this year. The effect has been to give an exorbitant gross yield to mortgage bankers of nearly 6 percent on a nominally 4½ percent Government-guaranteed mortgage.

The projected increase in the GI home-loan interest rate itself is simply one more item on the tight-money agenda. Where is it going to end? First they raise the FHA interest rate by a half percent. Now they want to raise the GI rate. What is this going to do to the interest rates on conventional loans? This indefinite boosting of interest rates is no answer at all. I think we should ask ourselves if we are not approaching the point where home buyers will not be able to meet the monthly payments on mortgage loans. An extra \$5 a month for interest is a lot of money to budget for most home purchasers.

Mr. President, we must take some positive action to bring additional funds into the GI home-loan market. Home-building activity is being sharply curtailed, and is likely to be strangled by the hard-money policies of this administration if they are continued.

The bills I send to the desk are designed to help reverse these policies before it is too late.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 88. A bill to amend title III of the National Housing Act to provide that the Federal National Mortgage Association shall exercise its special-assistance functions by purchasing mortgages securing loans which are guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 89. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use up to 25 percent of the national service life insurance fund for the purchase of loans guaranteed

under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

REDUCTION OF CERTAIN CORPORATE INCOME TAXES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I announced publicly on December 23 that I would continue my efforts to adjust corporate tax rates and give relief to low-income corporations. Today, I introduce a bill for this purpose. I would be pleased, of course, if the House of Representatives would send the Senate a bill containing this or more favorable tax relief for small businesses. If the House does not, however, I plan to offer the substance of this bill as an amendment to any corporation income tax proposals passed by the House of Representatives.

This bill is the same as S. 3129, which I introduced on February 3, 1956, and which I offered as an amendment to revenue measures on two different occasions in the second session of the 84th Congress. I regret that the Finance Committee was unable to hold hearings on my bill and that its merits were not debated on the floor of the Senate. On one occasion, the Senate was told that the urgency for extension of certain excise taxes did not permit consideration of my proposal. On the other occasion, my amendment was objected to on the ground that it was not germane to the bill under consideration. I am hopeful that the early introduction of this proposal in the 85th Congress will permit the scheduling of hearings before the Finance Committee and full consideration by the Senate.

My proposal is easily understood and provides a partial answer to the vexing problem of halting the trend toward bigger and more powerful economic concentration in this country. Existing law prescribes a normal tax rate of 30 percent on all taxable corporate income, and a surtax rate of 22 percent on taxable corporate income in excess of \$25,000. My bill, in essence, reverses these rates in a way which will increase Federal revenue and will reduce the tax bill for corporations earning less than \$225,000 per annum. I propose a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent. The effects of this change appear in the following table:

Effects of a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent

Income subject to normal tax and surtax	Present tax liability (normal rate 30 percent, surtax rate 22 percent)	Proposed tax liability (normal rate 22 percent, surtax rate 31 percent)	Change	
			Amount	Percent
\$5,000.....	\$1,500	\$1,100	-\$400	-26.7
\$10,000.....	3,000	2,200	-800	-26.7
\$15,000.....	4,500	3,300	-1,200	-26.7
\$20,000.....	6,000	4,400	-1,600	-26.7
\$25,000.....	7,500	5,500	-2,000	-26.7
\$50,000.....	20,500	18,750	-1,750	-8.5
\$100,000.....	46,500	45,250	-1,250	-2.7
\$225,000.....	111,500	111,500	(0)	(0)
\$500,000.....	254,500	257,250	+2,750	+1.1
\$1,000,000.....	514,500	522,250	+7,750	+1.5
\$10,000,000.....	5,194,500	5,292,250	+97,750	+1.9
\$100,000,000.....	51,994,500	52,962,250	+967,750	+1.9

¹ No change.

The small tax increase for corporations earning in excess of \$225,000 a year

will more than offset the tax reductions for small businesses, and will increase the total Federal tax yield from corporate taxpayers.

I will defer until a later date a detailed justification for this change in the corporate tax rates. For the present, however, I merely point out the prime consideration which moves me to introduce this bill. It is axiomatic that no living thing can remain static—it must grow or it must wither. The small corporations in our free economy cannot escape the inevitable—if they cannot grow, they must eventually pass from the business scene by failure or by absorption into a larger business unit. If present trends continue, we conceivably may find our economic fate in the hands of fewer and fewer corporate giants.

Small businesses can survive and grow only by retention of earnings. Earnings are their only reasonable source of new capital. They cannot compete for borrowings or in the securities markets. If Federal tax policies are not adjusted to relieve this biased position of small business units in their efforts to obtain growth capital, they have little hope for the future. I am convinced that tax relief is essential to a resolution of their dilemma.

Mr. President, I am quite optimistic about the prospects for small business tax relief this year. The small businessmen of the country were promised tax relief by both parties in the recent political campaign. In spite of recent discouraging statements by administration spokesmen, I believe that the Congress will not forget so quickly. I respectfully request the sympathetic consideration of this bill by all Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 150) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust corporate normal tax and surtax rates, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1957

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Federal aid for school construction.

The bill I introduce today would provide for this purpose an emergency program of \$2 billion in Federal funds, over a 2-year period. It would allocate funds on the basis of each State's population of school-age children. The States and their communities would be required to provide matching funds.

Mr. President, I call this an emergency program. I believe that today we face no graver domestic emergency than the tremendous shortage of classrooms throughout the Nation.

Even the most conservative estimates place the current shortage at a staggering 247,000 classrooms. In addition, our ever-increasing population creates a net increase of about one million new school-age children each year.

My bill is not intended to provide a long-range program. Neither does my

bill seek to answer other pressing problems, such as those of teachers' pay and the promotion of scientific education.

The bill is intended, however, as a measure which will result in the building of schools, and will do so promptly, while suitable long-range policy is developed.

Enactment of the bill could mean a start in building more than 100,000 new classrooms in the next 2 years.

I urge the Senate to give favorable consideration to the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Detroit Free Press of December 18, 1956, appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 197) to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to States and local communities, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This act may be cited as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1957."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For purposes of this act—

(1) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

(2) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, or the Canal Zone.

(3) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the governor or by State law.

(4) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State; and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains public schools. If a separate public authority has responsibility for the provision or maintenance of school facilities for any local educational agency or the financing of the construction thereof, such term includes such other authority.

(5) The term "school facilities," except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes), for education which is provided as elementary or secondary education, in the applicable State, at public expense and under public supervision and direction. Such term does not include athletic stadia, or other structures or facilities, intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public, or off-site improvements, or structures or facilities designed to be used exclusively for special activities, such as single-purpose auditoriums and gymnasiums.

(6) The terms "constructing" and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities;

erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 3. The Congress finds that there is an appalling national shortage of public elementary and secondary school facilities despite strenuous efforts of local communities, because their limited financial resources simply are not adequate to support necessary construction programs to eliminate such shortages. In many cases, local communities are hampered in their efforts to solve their problems by restrictive debt and tax limits, by their inability to borrow necessary funds at reasonable rates of interest, or similar reasons.

The Congress, while recognizing that responsibility for providing adequate school facilities is primarily that of the several States and their communities, finds that the national interest in our public-school system requires that the Federal Government assist State and local governments, consistent with their respective responsibilities, in meeting school-construction needs. The Congress recognizes that the solution of this problem will require a long-range Federal assistance school-construction program. However, in view of the emergency created by the appalling shortage of classrooms, an immediate Federal school-construction program is necessary. It is the purpose of this act to provide such emergency assistance to the States, so that this critical problem of inadequate school facilities may be attacked immediately in the light of current and anticipated school shortages, by authorizing grants to State educational agencies.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and the next succeeding fiscal year, such amounts, not to exceed \$1 billion in either fiscal year, as may be necessary for making payments to State educational agencies under this act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 5. From the total funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 4, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the total funds so appropriated as the school-age population of the State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all the States. As used in this section, the term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive, as determined on the basis of the most recent estimates certified by the Secretary of Commerce.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 6. (a) Any State which desires to accept the benefits of this act shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which shall—

(1) provide that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(2) set forth a program under which funds paid to the State under this act will be expended solely for school facilities construction projects approved by the State educational agency;

(3) set forth principles for determining the priority of projects in the State for assistance under this act which will assure that first priority will be given (consistent with the matching requirements of section 8) to local educational agencies which, upon making an effort commensurate with their economic resources, are unable, solely because of lack of such resources, to finance from the resources available to them the full cost of needed school facilities; the priority principles set forth in accordance with this paragraph shall take into account (A) the financial resources of the several local educational

agencies in the State, (B) the efforts which have been and are being made to meet their needs for school facilities out of State and local funds, and (C) the urgency of their needs for school facilities, determined according to conditions of overcrowding or lack of facilities, and extent to which unsafe and obsolete facilities are in use;

(4) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this act;

(5) provide to each local educational agency within the State applying for approval of a construction project under this act an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency;

(6) provide for the establishment of standards on a State level for planning and constructing school facilities; and

(7) provide that the State educational agency will make reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as is reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this act.

(b) Any State plan or modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) shall be approved by the Commissioner, but he shall not finally disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording the State educational agency involved reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

no further reservations shall be made under section 7 (b) for projects in the State, and there shall be no further payments for any project directly affected by such failure, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended. The Commissioner, after notice as provided in this subsection to any State, may suspend further reservations of funds under section 7 (b) for projects pending the making of findings under this subsection.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 7. (a) Payments under this act shall be made only to those State educational agencies which administer plans approved under section 6 and which furnish statements to the Commissioner in accordance with this section. Every statement shall set forth one or more projects approved by the State educational agency under the plan, the estimated cost of each such project, and the amount which the State educational agency desires to be paid out of the State's allotment for each project.

(b) Except as provided in section 8, the Commissioner shall issue, to each State educational agency furnishing a statement in accordance with subsection (a), a commitment reserving, out of the State's allotment, for each project included in the statement, the amount requested by the State educational agency for that project. Upon request of the State educational agency and receipt of an amended statement from such agency, the Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved, but only to the extent that the change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of the act. Such payments to the State educational agency shall be made by the Commissioner through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury, upon certification by the State educational agency that the financing of the re-

mainder of the cost of construction of the project has been arranged. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of constructing the project for which the amount was reserved and for no other purpose.

(c) If any project for which one or more payments have been made under this section is abandoned, or is not completed within a reasonable period determined under regulations of the Commissioner, the State to which such payments were made shall repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amount as may be reasonable under the circumstances (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the Federal district court for the district in which such project is located).

MATCHING BY STATES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

SEC. 8. The Commissioner may issue or modify a commitment under section 7 only if the amount to be reserved under the commitment, plus any amounts paid or to be paid under other commitments previously issued under this act to the same State educational agency, does not exceed one-half of the sum of (1) the cost of constructing the project in question and (2) the total cost of constructing the projects for which such other commitments have been issued, and if the State educational agency certifies that the remainder of the cost of constructing the project in question will be paid out of funds other than funds paid by the Commissioner under Public Law 815, 81st Congress, as amended. Until actual construction costs are available, cost determinations under this section shall be made on the basis of estimates furnished under section 7 (a) and revised estimates furnished in compliance with section 6 (a) (7).

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 9. (a) Any State dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action under section 6, may appeal to the United States district court for the district in which the capital of the State is located. Summons and notice of appeal may be served any place in the United States and the Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court a transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The court shall have jurisdiction either to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States, as provided in sections 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 10. (a) No payments shall be made by the Commissioner under this act to assist in financing the construction of any school facilities project, except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a-276a-5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than 1½ times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276c).

UTILIZATION OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 11. The Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government to assist him in administering the provisions of this act, and, without regard to section 3709, as amended, of the Revised Statutes, of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the head thereof. Payment for such services and facilities shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the head of the agency or institution concerned.

APPROPRIATION FOR ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for administration of this act.

DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 13. The Commissioner may delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his functions under this act except the making of regulations.

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN SCHOOLS

SEC. 14. In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

The editorial submitted by Mr. McNAMARA is as follows:

(From The Detroit Free Press of December 18, 1956)

McNAMARA'S SCHOOL BILL—BUILD NOW; DEBATE LATER

With his eyes wide open, Michigan's Senator PATRICK V. McNAMARA has proposed a \$2 billion emergency school building program.

He frankly labels the bill he will introduce in the coming 85th Congress as "no permanent answer to the shortage of school classrooms and no solution to such pressing problems as teachers' salaries and the need for scientific education."

"But it will build schools—now," he said.

McNAMARA suggests that the Federal Government appropriate a billion dollars a year for 2 years as a "crash" program to reduce the need for 247,000 new classrooms in the United States. He proposes that the money be distributed on a strict per capita basis with \$27.09 being reserved for each school-aged child in each State.

His proposal goes far beyond the ill-fated Kelly bill, which provided only \$400 million a year for 4 years and was snarled up and defeated when an amendment was attached to withhold Federal money from Southern States which failed to integrate children of all races in their schools.

McNAMARA shrewdly avoids the racial question. His proposal may gain favor simply because it's a short-term emergency program free of long-range policy-setting strings. McNAMARA is an increasingly potent Senator. He is a former able Detroit Board of Education member. His influence on educational matters in Congress is growing. He may be able to head off those who wish to complicate the bill with troublesome amendments.

Under his plan, Michigan—with 1,573,000 school-age children—would be eligible for \$42,604,000 in Federal money if either the State or local school districts could match the Federal grant on a 100-percent basis. Current reservations in school budgets wouldn't count, but any money set aside for building in budgets for the year beginning July 1, 1957, could be counted as matching funds.

The \$100 million State loan program, approved by voters last spring, also probably

would be considered as a source of matching money. The McNamara plan thus would help distressed school districts, at least in Michigan, by doubling the money available to them. The Kelly bill approached the need of distressed districts in a different and complicated fashion. The Federal grants would have been made only after considerations to determine each school district's need and its ability to finance its own school classrooms.

Under McNAMARA's plan, Michigan presumably could build in 2 years \$85,208,000 worth of schools if the State and local districts took 100 percent advantage of the proposed bill.

It is our continual claim that schools are the responsibility of local school districts. Some districts are poor. Some are comparatively wealthy. Some districts have taxpayers interested in schools who tax themselves heavily to provide good schooling for their young. Others are niggardly in their support of education.

The McNamara plan would override all these difficulties and help every child, every school district, and every State on an emergency dollar-for-dollar basis.

The Congressional Quarterly has predicted that a Federal-aid bill for school construction will be passed by Congress in the session opening January 3.

McNAMARA, who concedes that his bill isn't perfect but claims that his bill will build schools while the arguments rage over more permanent solutions, has what appears to be the best approach yet in a market that probably will be glutted with school-aid bills.

Until a better one is found, we support the McNamara plan.

TERMS OF UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT, MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize holding terms of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Court at Miami, Fla.

The need for this proposed legislation is simply predicated upon the tremendous amount of the appellate work originating in Miami. In fact, more appellate work originates there than in all the rest of Florida put together.

Miami, as all Senators know, has undergone a period of fast growth and development in recent years. Requiring the United States court of appeals to hold terms of court there is a service to which the people of the area are long since entitled. In addition, I feel confident that it will contribute immeasurably to the effectiveness of our judicial process.

I hope and trust that the Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate will act favorably on this bill at an early date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 275) to amend section 48 of title 28 of the United States Code in order to authorize holding terms of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit at Miami, Fla., introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PERMANENT STATUS FOR SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 300) to give the Small Business Administration permanent status, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it is my feeling that in introducing this amendment to the Small Business Act, of which I was the author in 1953, the time has now come when the agency should be firmly established as a permanent agency. The agency has done a creditable job in the field of financing to small firms, providing disaster aid, improving Government procurement programs, and affording technical and management aids to small firms.

However, any Government agency which is not established as a permanent agency operates under a handicap. It is difficult to staff such an agency with efficient and competent personnel, and public acceptance is hard to obtain when the future status of the agency is in doubt.

I feel that both Houses of Congress will take action in the present session to give SBA permanent operating authority. This act by Congress would constitute a major step forward in solidifying the position of the small-business firms in our expanding economy. No economy can endure and prosper without a healthy and vigorous small-business community.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of my very able and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Florida.

The creation of an additional judgeship for the southern district of Florida is badly needed to alleviate the civil and criminal-case logjam which presently exists. As a matter of fact, the situation is so bad that it is almost an impossibility properly and effectively to administer justice to litigants involved.

As you know, Mr. President, in the 83d Congress the Judiciary Committee, after a very extensive and thorough study unanimously recommended two judgeships for the State of Florida. When the legislation finally passed, Florida received only one.

As presently constituted the southern district comprises 45 counties, extending westward from the Atlantic along the boundary of the State of Georgia to and including Madison County, then southward from Levy and Alachua to include the greater part of the peninsula. Located within the boundary are the populous areas of Tampa, St. Petersburg,

Palm Beach, and Miami. According to the last official census taken in 1950, this area had a total population of 2,277,535 as compared to that of 493,770 of the northern district. The population of Dade County alone, one of the counties included in the southern district, was 495,083, or 1,300 more than the total population of the northern district. Of the State's total population of 2,771,305, which has increased substantially since the last official census—it being in the neighborhood of 3,800,000 today—over 80 percent is located within the southern district. The phenomenal growth in population within the southern district has increased the volume of Federal litigation, both civil and criminal, to such an extent that unreasonable delay in the proper administration of justice is the net result.

Statistics taken from the annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office, United States Courts, furnish ample proof of the heavy case burden now carried by the southern district. As of July 1, 1955, in the southern district of Florida, there was a total of 1,407 pending civil cases. During this fiscal year, 1,355 cases were commenced and 1,508 cases terminated, leaving pending as of June 30, 1956, 1,254 civil cases.

In the northern district, there was a total of 181 pending civil cases as of July 1, 1955; 197 cases were commenced and 254 terminated, leaving 124 civil cases pending on June 30, 1956.

On the criminal side there was a total of 474 cases pending on July 1, 1955; 816 criminal cases were commenced, and 1,023 terminated, leaving pending as of June 30, 1956, 267 cases, compared with the northern district which showed 49 criminal cases pending on July 1, 1955; 193 commenced, 213 terminated, leaving 29 criminal cases pending as of June 30, 1956.

The impact which the heavy case burden has on the proper administration of justice in the southern district was recognized by the Judicial Conference of the United States which recently recommended the creation of an additional judgeship for this area. This recommendation came only after a careful analysis was made of the situation which presently exists. The bill introduced today is designed to alleviate the case logjam in this district and to give effect to the views of the Judicial Conference, of the members of the bar, of the press, and of all citizens of the State of Florida who are familiar with the problem.

We know only too well that the orderly, speedy, and effective administration of justice is the concrete function of our system of government. It is a pillar of strength to our democracy and should never be allowed to decay. Not too infrequently have we been reminded of the fact that justice delayed is tantamount to justice being denied. Nothing could contribute more toward undermining the faith of our people in their institutions of government than carelessly to permit or condone by inaction a situation which prevents litigants from having their cases disposed of promptly and effectively, or which imposes upon such litigants undue hardships in seeking disposi-

tion of their cases. Unreasonable delay in the administration of justice, both civil and criminal, is therefore a situation which warrants prompt and effective corrective action by the Congress.

Since the facts justifying the need for an additional judgeship in the southern district are uncontrovertible, it is our hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will act promptly and favorably in reporting this bill to the Senate. In this way, we in the Congress can make a very marked contribution toward effective and proper administration of the laws of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 324) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the Southern District of Florida, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. PAYNE], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products. A similar bill was reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last summer, but was not acted on by the Senate. There are included as sponsors of the bill the names of Senators who sponsored the original bill. I understand there are several other Senators who wish to become sponsors. I ask unanimous consent that they may be permitted to add their names to the bill at any time through Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Vermont.

The bill (S. 313) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to lie on the desk through Wednesday next.

ESTABLISHMENT OF RULES OF INTERPRETATION GOVERNING QUESTIONS OF EFFECT OF ACTS OF CONGRESS ON STATE LAWS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and

other Senators whose names appear on the measure, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws.

This bill is similar to that reported by the Senate Judiciary committee during the last session of the Congress, Senate bill 3143.

I ask that the bill lie on the desk during the day so that other Senators who may wish to join as cosponsors may have the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and the bill will be on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The bill (S. 337) to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to lie on the desk.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROJECT FOR YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize modification of the Yaquina Bay and Harbor project in Oregon, in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers for this project.

The Yaquina Bay project is one of those which were added by the Senate to the omnibus rivers and harbors bill that passed the Congress at the end of the last session. It is an important project for the economic development of the area on the Oregon coast which would be served by the improved harbor facilities, and it has been determined by the Army engineers to have the favorable benefit cost ratio of 1.43 to 1. Consequently I was glad to have the opportunity during the last session, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, to have the facts about the project brought out in the committee's hearings in testimony by Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, and to win the committee's approval for including the Yaquina Bay project in the omnibus bill. With the help of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the project won authorization by the Senate and the conference with the House of Representatives, where it had not been included in the original omnibus bill.

However, along with many other worthy public works projects, the Yaquina Bay project authorization fell before President Eisenhower's veto of the omnibus bill after the end of the last session of the 84th Congress. The President's announced reason for his veto was that a number of projects in the omnibus bill had not completed all of the steps of administrative review and approval before their authorization by Congress. I am very pleased that, since last summer, the Yaquina Bay project, which had

already won the approval of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, has been approved by the Chief of Engineers and has been reported on by the Bureau of the Budget. I expect, therefore, no further objections to the authorization of the Yaquina Bay project again by the 85th Congress, and I hope that this action will be possible soon enough to permit the appropriation of funds to begin the work as soon as possible.

It is because of my faith in the basic importance of the Yaquina Bay project to the economic future of the Oregon seacoast that I have introduced this bill on the first day of this Senate session available for such purpose. All Senators have delayed until now out of courtesy to the President of the United States, so that he might appear before us with a special message before any legislation was offered for introduction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 338) to authorize modification of existing project for the Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oregon, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

TEN-YEAR PROGRAM PROPOSED TO IMPROVE RECREATION IN NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to provide for a 10-year program of improving and developing recreational facilities within the national forests of the United States. I introduce this bill on behalf of my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, three compelling reasons have motivated me to offer again a proposal which I first suggested in 1956. They are these:

First, the national forests, of which there are 149 in number, are of vast importance to the outdoor activities and recreation of the American people and thus to their health and outlook on life—indeed, more important than are the national parks in terms of annual visits.

Second, it is my fervent hope that this action, by a Member of the Senate, may prod the Eisenhower administration into demonstrating some leadership and activity in this all-important realm of national forest rehabilitation.

Third, when I recently spent over 4 months in my home State of Oregon, I met with my many friends and fellow members of such groups as the Izaak Walton League, National Wildlife Federation, the Mazamas, the Sierra Club, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, the Western Federation of Outdoor Clubs, the Oregon Roadside Council, and the National Park Association. I found the leaders of these conservation and outdoor groups

just about unanimous in their recommendation that I once more press for action on my original proposal for a program to promote recreation in the national forests—a program to parallel the so-called mission 66 of the National Park Service.

Nearly 50 million Americans now ski, hike, hunt, fish, swim, picnic, boat and mountain-climb in the national forests. Their wants and needs have been neglected. The multiple-use program has bogged down so far as recreation is concerned. There has been no general rehabilitation of recreational facilities since the bygone era of the Civilian Conservation Corps, two decades ago.

Due to advances in technology and short working hours, Americans today enjoy more leisure hours than during any period before in history. The automobile has brought our scenic outdoors within minutes of every city dweller. Americans own more than 50 million automobiles; the travel urge has perhaps never been so widely felt nor so easily satisfied.

In 1955 over 80 percent more people visited our national forests than in 1950. As our population continues to grow our forests will be utilized to an even greater degree by persons seeking wholesome outdoor recreation.

The expanded use of our recreational facilities has already been recognized through mission 66—a program of rehabilitation of the national parks. This bill would extend such a plan to cover our national forests, which were visited by 2½ times as many people as the national parks during 1955. Perhaps it should be called mission 67. The campsites and picnic areas in national forests require a major face-lifting operation if they are to serve adequately the millions of peripatetic outdoor lovers who migrate to the "woods" on vacations, for weekends, or even for an afternoon picnic.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart showing the comparative attendance in the national parks and national forests of the United States, and in my own State of Oregon, during the recent past be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States

	Attendance	
	National park	National forest
1950.....	13,918,872	27,368,000
1951.....	15,079,165	29,950,000
1952.....	17,142,658	33,007,000
1953.....	17,372,080	35,403,000
1954.....	17,968,596	40,304,000
1955.....	18,829,541	45,713,000

Oregon

	Attendance	
	National park	National forest
1950.....	310,796	1,778,000
1951.....	289,286	1,907,000
1952.....	312,677	2,275,000
1953.....	332,835	2,413,000
1954.....	370,554	2,803,000
1955.....	343,839	3,221,000

Mr. NEUBERGER. The bill which I introduce today provides for a survey and plan for the proper development of necessary facilities in our national-forest system, including such areas as might in the future be reserved for conservation and outdoor recreation. By this bill Congress would establish the recreational use of national forests as a national policy. Provisions of the bill direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive 1-year study of national forest recreational needs, and to present to Congress at the end of that time an overall plan for national forest improvement. Such a program would include provisions for development, maintenance, and operation of areas and facilities needed for public recreational use, adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities, and development and maintenance of wildlife habitat.

I believe that it is imperative that a comprehensive program should be prepared prior to appropriation of new and greater funds for the improvement of recreation areas, in order to facilitate the sound and constructive expenditure of such appropriations and to secure maximum utilization of the recreational opportunities offered by our national forests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 339) to establish recreational use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive study of national forest recreational use needs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the fact that the national forests constitute an invaluable asset in the recreational life of the people of the United States, providing actual and potential recreational possibilities of great importance to the national economy; that use of such forests for recreational purposes, including picnicking, camping, skiing, swimming, hunting, fishing, hiking, and mountain climbing is rapidly increasing, reaching an alltime high of 45,500,000 visits in 1955; that visits to improved recreational areas within the national forests have almost tripled since the 1930's when most of such areas were planned and their facilities constructed in connection with Civilian Conservation Corps projects; that many of such facilities are now reaching the age where heavy maintenance and even replacement are becoming necessary; that many popular recreational areas are now regularly overcrowded and an extensive program of construction of new facilities to accommodate present use is necessary; that the continuing increase in our population emphasizes the growing need for increasing the national forest recreational opportunities with new facilities; that the national forests comprise the largest area of productive habitat for public fishing and hunting grounds in the country; and that funds available to the Department of Agriculture for providing the necessary maintenance, replacement, and construction of national forest recreational areas and facilities and for wildlife habitat management are not adequate to meet present and

future needs; it is declared to be the policy of the Congress that public use of the national forests for purposes of recreation is a beneficial and proper use of such forests and that development and maintenance of areas and facilities for such public use, including maximum safety, sanitation, and wildlife habitat values, is a proper function of the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to initiate and carry out a comprehensive study of the personnel, funds, and other requirements necessary to develop within 10 years an adequate program for recreational use and wildlife habitat on the national forests and to provide the proper services and facilities to carry out the program. The Secretary shall within 1 year report to the Congress the results of the comprehensive study and his program recommendations including funds and any legislation necessary to permit implementation of the recommendations, such report and recommendations specifically to include provisions for (a) the development, maintenance, and operation of areas and facilities needed for public recreational use, (b) coordinating wildlife management with other resource uses and development and maintenance of wildlife habitat, and (c) adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in the closing days of last session, the Congress passed the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, a measure of outstanding importance to the western reclamation States.

When the measure went to the President for signature, however, he took exception to certain language in section 4 of the bill, which he deemed either an unlawful delegation of legislative function to a congressional committee, or an unconstitutional infringement on the separation of powers prescribed in articles I and II of the Constitution.

The President signed the bill because of its general merits and its extreme importance to the semi-arid States of the West. However, he pointed out in a message of August 6 that he had approved the measure upon assurances that the committees which handled the bill in the Congress would take action to correct its deficiencies early in the next session.

As a representative of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I had carried such assurances to the President prior to his action on the bill. My action was taken after consultation with colleagues on the Senate and House subcommittees.

I feel sure that all Members of Congress from the 17 reclamation States greatly appreciate the action of the President in giving his approval to this vital legislation under these circumstances. And I believe that this body can be assured that the Reclamation and Irrigation Subcommittee will expedite action on the proposed legislation.

My amendment eliminates the language to which the President took exception. The language deleted from the 1956 act provided for a veto by congressional committees of contracts negotiated by the executive branch. Under the

amended language, the Secretary of the Interior remains charged with determining project feasibility, but execution of the contract is deferred until congressional committees have had 60 days to consider it.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, and request unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the *RECORD* along with my remarks.

The *PRESIDENT pro tempore*. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The bill (S. 340) to amend section 4 (c) of the act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1044), relating to the construction of small reclamation projects, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4, subsection (c), of the act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1044, 1045), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If the project is found by the Secretary and the Governor of the State in which it is located (or an appropriate State agency designated by him) to be financially feasible and upon determination by the Secretary that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this act, the Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate a contract with the applicant organization as provided in section 5; but no such contract shall be executed by the Secretary prior to 60 calendar days (which 60 days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain) from the date on which the project proposal has been submitted to both branches of the Congress for consideration by the appropriate committees thereof. The Secretary at the time of submitting the project proposal to Congress or at the time of his determination that the requested project constitutes a reasonable risk under the provisions of this act, may reserve from use or disposition inimical to the project any lands and interests in land owned by the United States which are within his administrative jurisdiction and subject to the disposition by him and which are required for use by the project. Any such reservation shall expire at the end of 2 years unless the repayment contract provided for in section 5 of this act shall have been executed."

IMMIGRATION BILLS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR WATKINS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce for reference to the Judiciary Committee four bills amending the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

These measures are identical to those introduced by me in the 2d session of the 84th Congress designed to carry out the recommendations of President Eisenhower's special message on immigration.

At the outset I emphasize one particular point: I have no intention of repudiating the general conclusions reached by Congress in 1952 when the Immigration and Nationality Act was adopted. I continue my agreement with the general principles of immigration policy which were incorporated in that

law. Therefore, I will highlight what my proposed amendments do not do:

First. They do not make a single change in the provisions of the law relating to the acquisition of citizenship; except for certain veterans of the United States Armed Forces and their close relatives. My amendments make no changes as to the loss of United States citizenship.

Second. They do not add or subtract a single ground for deporting an alien from the United States.

Third. They do not lift a single one of the bars which now forbid the admission to the United States of an alien who would be a danger to the national security. In a nutshell what do the amendments seek to accomplish? My amendments would do the following:

First. They would transfer to the executive branch of the Government much of the discretionary powers in the enforcement of the immigration law which are now exercised by the Congress through the lengthy, inefficient, and expensive process of private legislation, without surrendering any of the powers of a Member of Congress to introduce such a bill when the executive branch could not or would not act.

Second. They would incorporate into the law a number of technical amendments recommended by those who administer the present law, including three provisions to enlarge the citizenship privileges of—and revise the expatriating provisions relating to—members of the Armed Forces, past and present, and their families. They would also grant legislative approval to four different administrative interpretations of existing law.

Third. They would guarantee the use but prevent the abuse of our judicial process by deportable or inadmissible aliens whose sole object is to prevent or delay their removal from this country.

Fourth. They would increase the maximum limitations upon the number of aliens who may obtain visas to come to the United States to live permanently. This does not mean that the amendments guarantee the admission of a greater number of aliens; they do increase the potential maximum number.

The four major amendments, which I have introduced, parallel bills which I previously introduced on February 8, 1956. These were the only specific bills on which open hearings were conducted by the subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the 84th Congress. At those hearings, my bills, S. 3167, S. 3168, S. 3169, and S. 3170, were officially endorsed by the administration, and their enactment was urged by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, representing the two agencies of the Government directly concerned in the administration and enforcement of the immigration and nationality laws.

EXPLANATION OF THE FIRST OF THE FOUR BILLS
WHICH IS THE SAME AS S. 3167 OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

SUBSTITUTION FOR PRIVATE RELIEF IMMIGRATION BILLS

The need:

First. Private legislation ties up Congress and committees.

Second. System inequitable because not all deserving cases are considered.

Third. Congressional committee works through a staff. Staff does not investigate but obtains reports from executive agencies, chiefly the Justice Department. Proposal gives powers to agencies, which now investigate selected cases for the Congress, to act directly on every deserving case. The proposal does not seek to cut off right of any Member of Congress to introduce a bill. It should materially reduce the number.

The bill:

Classes eligible: Veterans; husbands, wives, mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters of (a) citizens and (b) permanently admitted aliens; clergymen, missionaries, brothers and sisters in religious sense of the term.

Charges forgiven: Any ground of inadmissibility, except those relating to certain subversive classes, for aliens seeking to come to the United States; any ground of deportability for aliens already here.

How administered: By the Attorney General in both cases. With respect to those outside the United States only upon recommendation of the Secretary of State or the United States Consul abroad.

Limitations: Five thousand in any calendar year total of both classes. Reduction of a quota number for each case unless alien had previously used a quota number or was or is a nonquota alien. Attorney General must be of opinion in each case that action would not be contrary to national interest, safety, or security.

EXPLANATION OF THE SECOND OF THE FOUR BILLS
WHICH IS SIMILAR TO S. 3168 OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS BILL

Section 1: Repeals paragraphs 16 and 17 of section 212 (a) of the act which relates to aliens who have been excluded or deported or removed from the United States. It eliminates requirements that they obtain permission from the Attorney General before they may apply for visas or for entry to the United States. It also repeals section 276 of that same act which requires prosecution of such aliens who return without having complied with the permission requirement.

The requirement is archaic. It existed in law before the present quota system became a part of the law. An applicant for admission or for a visa should be judged on his present eligibility to enter and there are adequate other safeguards to protect the Government without this requirement.

Section 2: Amends section 212 (d) (4) of the act which provides for a waiver of visas and passports for nonimmigrants on conditions, one of which is on the basis of unforeseen emergency in individual cases. Removing the word "unforeseen" permits greater administrative latitude.

Section 3: Eliminates the requirement of inspecting and of applying all grounds of exclusion to aliens coming from Alaska and Hawaii to the mainland United States. By definition, these Territories are a part of the United States. Aliens who are already in these Territories are subject to all the provisions of the act.

If an alien was deportable before he came to the mainland he would remain deportable. An additional exclusion order avails nothing in his case; unnecessarily delays travel and ties up inspecting manpower.

Section 4: Amends sections 221 (b) and 263 (a) of the act which require the fingerprinting of all aliens applying for visas, and all nonimmigrants who came to the United States without visas who have remained for 30 days or more. The proposal would amend these sections and would permit the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, respectively, to waive fingerprinting of nonimmigrant aliens. There would be no change in requirement that every person coming here to reside permanently must be fingerprinted. No need to gild the lily on various reasons which prompt this proposal.

Section 5: Amends section 236 (a) of the act by clarifying statutory authority for separating the role of hearing officer from that of the officer who presents the Government's case in the conduct of selected admissibility hearings. It removes any doubt as to the authority of the Immigration Service to separate these two functions where the Service deems it advisable. All are agreed on the desirability of separating them in certain contested cases. The law presently makes specific provision for such separation in deportation hearings, but is silent on admissibility hearings.

Section 6: Amends section 238 (d) of the act to the extent that the Attorney General would be authorized, in his discretion, to dispense with examination inspection in the case of aliens proceeding in direct transit through the United States, under safeguards, and subject to agreements with the aliens and carriers. Under the present law, though they may be exempted from documentary requirements, they must be inspected and examined and are subject to the exclusion and deportation provisions which apply to immigrants coming here to reside permanently. This proposal in effect creates something like the "free-port" which exists for customs purposes on goods which are merely stored in the United States waiting transshipment out of the country after they have been brought here from abroad by another carrier. The aliens involved are, for the most part, individuals who are traveling from Europe or the Orient destined to Canada or Latin-America who are using our air gateways at New York, San Francisco, and Miami. The proposal facilitates international travel and encourages use of our own flag carriers by passengers desiring to use our more direct air routings to their ultimate destinations.

Section 7: Would grant relief from deportation for certain refugees under the DP Act of 1948 who are now subject to deportation under the act because they obtained their visas fraudulently. Relief of this kind would be given only to cases where the alien perpetrated the fraud to avoid repatriation to his homeland for fear of persecution and not where it can be shown the fraud was perpetrated to evade quota restrictions

or to prevent investigation of his background.

Section 8: Amends section 242 (b) of the act to furnish statutory authority for the Attorney General to commence deportation proceedings with an order to show cause, which procedure is now being followed. It was thought necessary to commence every deportation case by physical arrest, which in most instances was not only unnecessary but frequently caused great fright and considerable anguish, particularly in cases involving infants, aged aliens, and persons who were not likely to abscond. While the authority for the new procedure under existing law is believed implicit in the statute, the proposed legislation would remove any doubt and prevent a possible challenge of a proceeding on this ground. The right to issue a warrant of arrest in the relatively few cases where it is found necessary to take an alien into custody or impose restrictions on him is not limited or restricted by this amendment.

Section 9: Amends section 245 of the act by deleting clause 5 of subsection (a). Under the present clause an alien who seeks to adjust his status in the United States without reentry, as the husband or wife of an American citizen, cannot do so unless he had been in the United States for a year before such a marriage. All the present statute accomplishes in most cases is to require the money put aside to start a new family unit in the United States to be expended on travel out of the country to obtain a piece of paper from an American consul abroad—there is no quota for these aliens; they come in extraquota—and reenter with that document. There are ample other safeguards in the law to take care of the rare fraudulent marriage.

Section 10: Codifies several statutes relating to the naturalization of war veterans with proper safeguards to make certain that benefits are limited to those who have served honorably in an active-duty status. Veterans who have had active duty during wartime shall be eligible for naturalization regardless of length of service. Peacetime veterans shall be eligible for naturalization after 3 years. A person who was unable to serve the full 3 years because of a disability incurred during service is provided with a special exemption. The requirement that certain veterans must present proof of admission for permanent residence has resulted in many deserving veterans not being eligible for naturalization and this proposal would eliminate that requirement.

No person shall be regarded as having been separated under honorable conditions if he was separated on account of alienage, or if he was a conscientious objector, or if he performed no military, air, or naval service whatever, or if he refused to wear a uniform. Such persons would not benefit from this proposal. Citizenship granted pursuant to this proposal may be revoked if, at any time subsequent to naturalization, the person is separated from the Armed Forces under other than honorable conditions.

Sections 11 and 12 of S. 3168 of the 84th Congress as introduced dealt with the deportation of alien violators of our narcotics laws. Those provisions were included in other legislation last year and now appear on the Statutes as part of Public Law 728, Title III; therefore, I have added two other technical amendments in place of those sections which have been adopted:

Section 11 (a) Under section 316 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain aliens who are employed abroad by American firms, and so forth, can obtain permission to go abroad for extended periods without losing their eligibility for naturalization which might result from the interruption of their residence in this country. However, the law makes no provision at present for their spouses and children who also wish to go abroad and also are anxious not to lose their residence in the United States. This proposal would give the spouse or children of such alien the same privileges as the employed alien himself.

(b) Under section 310 of the existing law, a petition for naturalization must be filed in a court in the jurisdiction where the petitioner actually resides. Bearing in mind that the existing selective service acts call for induction of many persons in the United States who are sent away for training to various camps throughout the country, a terrific burden is placed on an alien who goes into the Armed Forces and then finds that although he has all the qualifications for naturalization, he is unable to return to his home State to file a petition for naturalization, and remain long enough to complete the naturalization case. This proposal would permit a member of the Armed Forces who is applying for naturalization under the ordinary provisions of the law to file a petition in any naturalization court.

(c) Under section 316 (a) of existing law, a petitioner for naturalization must have 6 months continuous residence in a particular State immediately preceding the filing of his petition. For the same reasons given above this is a barrier to the naturalization of aliens who are in the United States Armed Forces. The proposal would eliminate the requirement of a particular period of residence in any particular State. This would mean that the soldier could apply wherever he was stationed or any other place that would be convenient for him.

Section 12: Under existing law much difficulty has been encountered in the interpretation of section 101 (b) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the meaning of the term "stepchild." As now written that term has been held not to apply to a child born out of wedlock to a woman who subsequently married a man not the father of the child. This results in a separation of families since a child in the circumstances described is not in a position to be given a nonquota or preferred status under the law. The proposal would place a stepchild born out of wedlock in the same position as other stepchildren, so far as the admission provisions of the law are concerned.

Section 13: Amends section 101 (b) (1) of the act by extending the definition of

"child" to include an illegitimate child claiming benefits under the law through its mother and also to include adopted children under the age of 12, if prior to seeking benefits under the immigration law, they have resided with the adoptive parents at least 2 years. The proposal would cover appealing and distressing hardship cases which have arisen in the case of illegitimate children and children of tender age who have been adopted.

Section 14: Amends section 202 (a) (5) of the act by removing the limitation which prevents an Asian whose quota is exhausted from coming under the quota or nonquota classification of the accompanying spouse. These privileges are presently available to aliens of other origins. There is no desire or plan here to change the requirement that a primary applicant for admission who is of Asian origin must be chargeable to the special Asian quota regardless of birthplace.

Section 15: Amends section 203 of the act to grant the same preference status to a spouse or child "following to join" an alien entitled to a preferred classification by reason of his special skills, as if the spouse and child were accompanying the alien. It is not possible for families always to travel together and the change would be desirable in order to cover the situations where the spouse or children follow the principal alien.

The proposal would also result in the fourth preference category under the quota being accorded a fixed 10 percent of the quota instead of the present undetermined portion, reducing the second category of preference immigrants from 30 to 20 percent.

The proposal would also establish the limitation wherein the immigrant would be eligible for fourth preference only on the approved petition of a United States citizen 21 years of age or over, and would include in that preference the spouse or child of a primary applicant.

Section 16: Amends section 281 of the act so as to give the Secretary of State wider latitude to waive visa fees for non-immigrant aliens and to permit clarification of the existing provisions relating to the computation of such fees.

Section 17: Amends section 212 (a) (9) of the act. The proposal would have the effect of providing that in determining whether a criminal misdemeanor was committed, as a ground for exclusion of an alien, United States law shall control.

Section 18: Amends section 221 (f) of the act to eliminate the requirement for eventual individual documents for alien crewmen. The requirement for the issuance of individual documents has proved to be difficult to administer, unduly burdensome, and unnecessary. The present visaed crew list satisfies both State and Justice Departments.

Section 19: Amends section 222 (a) and (c) of the act to eliminate the reference to "race and ethnic classification" information in applications for immigrant and nonimmigrant visas. The terms are not susceptible of definition and have served no useful purpose in the administration of the law.

Section 20 and section 21: Amend sections 353 and 354 of the act to broaden

those sections by giving to veterans of the Spanish-American War and World Wars I and II, their spouses, children and dependent parents broader foreign residence privileges without losing United States citizenship.

Section 22: Amends the proviso to section 223 (b) of the act to give the Attorney General the right to extend the life of the reentry permit, for such period as he deems appropriate, of a wife or child of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed abroad, beyond the 1 year period allowed by present law. The existing law has resulted in hardship to alien spouses and children of servicemen stationed abroad.

Section 23: Adds a new subsection to section 323 of the act which would permit the expeditious naturalization of children adopted by United States citizens stationed abroad in the Armed Forces, or abroad in the employment of the United States Government, or abroad in the employment of an American firm or international organization. The new subsection would provide that there must be a showing that the child is residing and will continue to reside with the adoptive parents. At the present time the adoptive child is required to establish 2 years' residence and 1 year's physical presence in the United States during the 2 year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. The proposal would remove these requirements. The citizen adoptive parent would be required to declare before the naturalization court an intention to have the child take up residence in the United States as soon as the adoptive parent terminates his service or employment abroad. This worthy proposal prevents unnecessary separation of families.

EXPLANATION OF THE THIRD OF THOSE FOUR BILLS WHICH IS THE SAME AS S. 3169 OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

JUDICIAL RELIEF BILL

The need: Repetitive court actions of administrative decisions by way of

Formula	Total
Present 1/6 of 1 percent selected 1920 population.	154,657
Proposed 1/2 of 1 percent total 1950 population.	219,461

Second. Cancels mortgage upon quotas resulting from Displaced Persons Act and previous shepherd laws.

Third. Permits use of unused quota numbers of basis of four geographical regional pools throughout the world: Europe, Asia, Africa, and Oceania. Unused quotas in each region would be available for distribution each year to aliens entitled to preference status under the present law, if they were born within the region, regardless of the particular country in which they were born.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, were received, read twice by their titles,

habeas corpus declaratory judgment actions, applications for injunctive relief, and so forth, enabling some of the more notorious among our deportable criminal aliens to defeat deportation for years.

The bill:

Form of review:

First. Habeas corpus for any alien found deportable and held in custody or for any alien excluded from admission to the United States; or

Second. Petition for review for any alien found deportable and not held in custody.

Limitations:

First. Alien must not have physically departed United States after administrative order of excludability or deportability.

Second. All administrative review must have been exhausted.

Third. The administrative order must not previously have been determined to be valid in any judicial proceeding—unless new grounds presented or court finds prior proceedings inadequate or ineffective to test validity.

Fourth. No action may be withdrawn without consent of both respondent and court.

Fifth. Issue determined on administrative record and findings of fact in administrative proceeding if supported by reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence shall be considered conclusive; except a trial de novo is provided when United States nationality is claimed.

Sixth. Court action must be brought in vicinity where alien is located instead of at Washington, D. C. This will greatly serve to eliminate the delays resulting from the congestion of the court calendar in the District of Columbia.

EXPLANATION OF THE FOURTH OF THE BILLS WHICH IS THE SAME AS S. 3170 OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

Quota bill:

First. Computation of quotas:

Formula	Total	Allocation
Present 1/6 of 1 percent selected 1920 population.	154,657	To each area according to its percentage of representation in United States population.
Proposed 1/2 of 1 percent total 1950 population.	219,461	(a) 154,657 as at present. (b) 5,000 to aliens having special skills regardless of nationality. (c) 5,000 plus increase of 100 for all minimum quota areas. (d) 55,000 plus to each country in proportion to its share of total immigration to United States in last 3 decades.

and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 343. A bill to authorize the admission to the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

S. 344. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes;

S. 345. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders, and for other purposes; and

S. 346. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROJECT FOR SIUSLAW RIVER, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my distinguished

colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize modification of the existing project for the Siuslaw harbor and bar at Florence, Oreg. Representative CHARLES O. PORTER of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District has introduced an identical bill, H. R. 1212, in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill for the development of Siuslaw Harbor be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, development of Siuslaw Harbor and Bar at Florence, Oreg., will give the 140,000 people of Lane County and the lower Willamette Valley a port of direct access to the Pacific Ocean.

The port of Siuslaw was the first port district formed in Oregon back in 1909 and is the only port on the Oregon coast in which local people have more money invested than the Federal Government. No maintenance work has been done on the north jetty since its completion in 1917 and the south jetty has not been maintained since its completion in 1918. At the present time the outer end of the north jetty is completely under water at all times, and with gaping holes in its structure all the way back to the beach line. Tons of sand wash into the channel during the prevailing northwest winds of the summer.

The area to be served by the development of Siuslaw Harbor has grown rapidly, and the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area has a population of almost 140,000 and retail sales of \$162 million and is the fifth largest metropolitan district in the entire Pacific Northwest. The population growth in Western Lane County, in the area of Florence, has been rapid, and current population estimates place the number of people at 30,000. The population of the city of Florence has doubled since 1950.

Lane County is currently constructing Route F, a highway which will provide Eugene and Springfield with direct water-level access to Florence and will bring these major Oregon cities closer to an outlet to the sea than any other major metropolitan area in Oregon. Route F will open up vast new possibilities in transportation of commodities, and this highway goes hand in hand with the development of the port of Siuslaw. The Southern Pacific Railroad furnishes rail transportation to Western Lane County at Mapleton and Cushman on their line from Eugene to Coos Bay.

To show the potential of an improved harbor at Florence, recently one of the largest single barge loads of lumber to cross the bar was shipped from the Siuslaw by Sause Bros. Ocean Towing Co. The barge was loaded with 1,800,000 board-feet of lumber from Davidson Industries at Tiernan and LaDuke Lumber Co. at Cushman bound for California markets. The port commissioners have been informed that no more attempts will be made to bring LST's in until improvements are made, as the risk is too great under existing conditions.

The division engineer reports that a realistic estimate of the production that would move from Siuslaw River with the

desired improvements is believed to be about 80 million board-feet annually.

Mr. President, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors at its meeting on November 29 to 30, 1956, held in Washington, D. C., accepted the views and recommendations of the North Pacific division engineer. The Board recommends modification of the existing project for the Siuslaw River to provide for a 600-foot extension of the north jetty; an entrance channel 18 feet deep and 300 feet wide from deep water in the ocean to a point 1,500 feet inside the outer end of the existing jetty; thence a channel 16 feet deep, 200 feet wide with additional widening at bends, and about 5 miles long, to a turning basin, 16 feet deep, 400 feet wide, and 600 feet long, opposite the Siuslaw dock at Florence. Construction of the north jetty extension is to be deferred until experience demonstrates, in the judgment of the Chief of Engineers, that this work is advisable.

The port of Siuslaw has concurred in the recommendations of the Board and of the North Pacific division engineer.

The improvements to Siuslaw Harbor and Bar can add much to the growth and economy of Oregon, Lane County, and the lower Willamette Valley. With the completion of Route F from Eugene to the coast, Eugene, Springfield, and the metropolitan area will have a direct access to the sea.

Mr. President, I hope that Congress will give careful consideration to the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and that the improvements for the Siuslaw will be authorized.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 347) to authorize modification of existing project for the Siuslaw River, Oreg., introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the modification of the project for improvement of the Siuslaw River, Oreg., is hereby adopted and authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated November 30, 1956, at an estimated Federal cost of \$1,693,100, the work to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE TAX LAWS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the time has come when for the Congress to delay any further extending critically needed help to the small-business men of this Nation is to court economic disaster. There are many vital domestic problems which call for speedy and wise action by the Congress. None of these problems, however, cries out for our attention in more urgent tones than those relating to small business.

That a large portion of the small-business community of our Nation, comprising more than 4 million firms, and accounting for more than 95 percent of our total business enterprises, in the past few years has been pushed closer and closer to the brink of bankruptcy is a matter of common knowledge.

As recently as last Wednesday, January 2, headlines in the New York Times proclaimed: "Failures Climb to 15-Year High—Small Business Has Big Troubles." Beneath this headline the facts were set forth, in part, as follows:

Heightened competition, particularly in the field of retail and wholesale distribution, took a higher toll in failures in 1956 than any year since 1941. From the standpoint of dollar liability of failures, the total last year was the highest since 1935.

The article continued:

Small business was much in the news in 1956. It made news because it was in trouble.

This is not news to the members of the Select Committee on Small Business. In its reports to the Senate, reports which have been based on careful studies and investigations, the committee for the past several years has tried to drive home the inescapable fact that our free-enterprise system has become imperiled by the rapid deterioration in the position of small and independent business establishments.

The extent and gravity of this deterioration is frightening in its implications. We know that in the distributive trades, in wholesaling and retailing, there has been what almost amounts to an epidemic of failures.

The position of small and medium-size manufacturing plants would seem to be equally precarious. From 1952 through 1955, a period during which our overall economy continued to expand, we find that there has been a net decrease of 18,900 manufacturing companies. Almost 19,000 manufacturing establishments fell by the wayside, the victims of what for many small-business men has been a prosperity without profits. This high mortality rate among small manufacturers cannot be attributed to normal attrition, because during this period our business population in other fields of endeavor has expanded. In this connection, it is significant that small manufacturers' share of total manufacturing sales has declined from 19 percent in 1947 to a completely inadequate 12.3 percent during the first half of 1956.

I am convinced, as one must be convinced who has given the subject serious thought, that independent small business in this country will never regain its rightful and traditional share of the rich rewards of our economic system, unless, to the degree that commonsense and national self-interest dictate, it is assured an opportunity to compete on equal terms with its larger rivals in the market place.

Of the many small-business-problem areas susceptible of legislative relief, none should take precedence over those involving taxes, financial and credit assistance, and increased antitrust protection.

To bring much-needed relief to small business in the tax field, I introduce for appropriate reference five bills. Each of these bills is designed to bring the maximum relief to those who need it most—the very smallest corporations, partnerships, and proprietorships, whether they be machine shops, farms, or the corner grocery store.

I propose at an early date to present a detailed analysis of each of these five tax bills, but today I shall confine myself to a brief description of them and what they are designed to do.

The first bill provides for a graduated corporate income tax. I first introduced this bill in the closing weeks of the 84th Congress. While the press of other major legislation prevented its consideration last year, the response to the bill was so encouraging that I decided to reintroduce it in this Congress.

This bill would substitute graduate rates for the present normal and surtax rates applicable to corporate income. The present law imposes a normal tax of 30 percent on the first \$25,000 of corporate net income and a surtax of 22 per-

cent, for a total statutory rate of 52 percent on all net income over \$25,000. My bill would start with a tax rate of 5 percent on the first \$5,000 of corporate net income and would result in a tax saving of all corporations having up to \$375,000 of net income. This would mean a tax saving to nearly 98 percent of all corporations. The top rate on my bill would be 55 percent and would apply to all net income over \$100,000. Only some 2 percent of all corporations would pay increased taxes under this bill, and then only in relatively minor amounts.

I am sure my colleagues would be interested in a more detailed comparison of this bill and the present law, and I am therefore requesting that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a table showing the tax yields at various taxable income levels, together with data showing the amount and percent of change in corporate income tax payments that would result from the bill which I have introduced.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—Comparison of present and proposed corporate income tax laws

Income subject to tax	Effective rate (percent)		Present tax liability	Proposed tax liability	Change	
	Present law	Proposed law			Amount	Percent
\$5,000	30	5	\$1,500	\$250	-\$1,250	-83.3
\$10,000	30	7.5	3,000	750	-2,250	-75.0
\$15,000	30	10	4,500	1,500	-3,000	-66.6
\$20,000	30	13.75	6,000	2,750	-3,250	-54.2
\$25,000	30	18	7,500	4,500	-3,000	40
\$50,000	41	31.5	20,500	15,750	-4,750	-23.2
\$100,000	46.5	38.25	46,500	38,250	-8,250	-17.7
\$250,000	49.8	47.7	124,500	120,750	-3,750	-3.01
\$375,000	50.53	50.53	189,500	189,500	None	None
\$500,000	50.9	51.65	254,500	258,250	+3,750	+1.22
\$1,000,000	51.4	53.33	514,500	533,250	+18,750	+3.6
\$5,000,000	51.9	54.68	2,594,500	2,733,250	+138,750	+5.3
\$10,000,000	51.95	54.83	5,194,500	5,483,250	+288,750	+5.6

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am informed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that this bill will not cause any loss in revenue. In fact it would bring about an increase in revenue in the neighborhood of ninety to one hundred million dollars. While this amount is significant, I am further informed that it would not be possible to reduce any of the rates in the bill as it stands without causing revenue loss.

It would, of course, be highly desirable to avoid an increase in the tax rate of any corporation. As I have already noted, the bill which I have introduced, with a top rate of 55 percent, would bring increased taxes to about 2 percent of the corporations in this country today. Retaining a top rate of 52 percent in my bill, so that the rates would not exceed those under the present law, would mean a revenue loss of around \$900 million. That would be the extent of the loss if corporate income continued at its mid-1956 rate. This body might well wish to consider placing a top rate of 52 percent in this bill, however, bearing in mind the President's endorsement last August of recommendations of his Cabinet Committee on Small Business which would have resulted in revenue losses approaching \$740 million.

The enactment of this bill, taken in conjunction with the provision of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code which gives partnerships and proprietorships an election to be taxed as corporations, would do more than anything I can propose to bring quick and meaningful relief to small firms which are now so heavily burdened by our tax structure.

The other four tax bills which I have introduced today would benefit all forms of small business, unincorporated as well as incorporated.

One of these bills would extend the benefits of rapid depreciation to purchasers of used equipment. The 1954 Internal Revenue Code added a new provision to our tax law which enabled purchasers of new equipment to write off the cost of such equipment at accelerated rates. This, of course, means a tax saving to such businessmen. It is a well-recognized fact, however, that many small concerns cannot afford the present-day high costs of certain equipment which they need to run their businesses. They must buy used equipment at the prices they can afford to pay. I know of no good reason why the purchasers of such equipment should not be granted the same privilege of rapid depreciation now given to purchasers of new equipment. By virtue of the very fact that the

equipment is used and possibly approaching obsolescence when purchased, it would appear to me to be only fair that the purchaser should be entitled to write off his cost over a relatively short period of time.

Another one of the bills which I have introduced today would liberalize the requirements on the payment of estate taxes. It is a well established fact that our Federal estate taxes often drain off all of the liquid funds of the small, family business when one of the proprietors dies. Under the present law, the tax on the estate of the deceased is payable 1 year after the death of the decedent, except that on a showing of hardship the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may authorize payment over a 10-year period. The administration of this phase of our tax law has proven burdensome to some small businesses, indeed fatal to some, for the reason that the test as to what constitutes hardship is not clear. The bill which I have introduced on this subject will alleviate the problem to a great extent. It grants an estate an election to pay the estate tax over a period of 10 years without any showing of hardship. In addition, where hardship can be shown—and the term "hardship" is defined in the bill in terms of equities in a business—the tax be paid over a period of 20 years.

One of the great benefits extended to businesses in the 1954 Internal Revenue Act was that contained in the provisions relating to approved profit-sharing plans and pension plans. Those provisions authorized sizable deductions from taxable income for contributions made by employers to pension and profit-sharing plans established for the benefit of their employees. By virtue of the language of the law, only employees could benefit from the plans. This means that a sole stockholder of a corporation who also serves as the president of the corporation may qualify as an employee of the corporation and thus be a beneficiary under its pension or profit-sharing plan. But a member of a partnership or a proprietor of an unincorporated business does not qualify as an employee under the law and thus cannot be a beneficiary under any of these tax-exempt plans. Such plans have great and obvious advantages for the man who wants to save for his own future and for the future security of his family. One of the bills which I have introduced today would entitle the proprietors of unincorporated businesses to the benefits of the tax-exempt plans.

Lastly, I have introduced a bill which would grant an election to certain corporations to be taxed as partnerships. This would benefit some small corporations which are hit especially hard by double taxes—first on the corporation and then on its stockholders on receipt of dividends. It would also be of some benefit to small corporations which might otherwise be vulnerable to the surtax on surplus accumulations. The election would be extended to all corporations having not more than 10 stockholders, all stockholders being active in the business.

With respect to the last four bills which I have mentioned, I was encouraged to note that the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business, in its report of last August, recommended similar tax legislation for the relief of small business. In view of the President's endorsement of the Committee's proposals, I am very hopeful that the program which I have outlined briefly here today will receive substantial bipartisan support.

I firmly believe that all of these measures are necessary. If small business is to continue to serve its vital part in our economy, and if we are to reverse the trend of recent years toward ever-increasing concentration of economic power, then tax relief for small business is the one quickest way of reaching that goal. I fervently hope that my colleagues will give this legislation the support I believe it deserves.

I am also drafting legislation which will strengthen the antitrust laws by providing for prior notification to the appropriate governmental agencies of anticipated significant mergers, strengthening the enforcement powers of the Federal Trade Commission, and providing that bank mergers involving asset acquisitions which substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly be subject to the provisions of the Clayton Act. In recognition of the dire need that small businesses have for adequate credit, I expect within the next few days to introduce legislation which, if enacted, will establish capital banks and a procedure whereby loans to small concerns can be insured by the Federal Government.

Of course, the Congress has recognized that there is a continuing need for an independent agency which will concern itself with the problems of small business; an agency to make such recommendations to the Congress and the President as are necessary in the public interest for the maintenance of a healthy small-business community. The authorizing legislation for the present agency for small business, the Small Business Administration, is to expire on June 30, 1957. In some respects this basic legislation has failed to give the agency the authority it needs to become the independent spokesman for small business it ought to be. Therefore, I expect to introduce legislation which would strengthen this agency and provide for its continued operation.

I have outlined a legislative program for small business which, if adopted, will, I feel certain, go a long way toward making it possible for our more than 4 million small and independent enterprises to survive and prosper in today's fiercely competitive economy. Senators now have the text of my tax proposals for their consideration and, as I have pointed out, I expect to discuss in the near future each of the proposals more completely. When, in the near future, I introduce the other measures of this small-business program, I shall at that time fully discuss and explain the need for each of these bills.

I ask unanimous consent that the bills may be printed in the *RECORD*, and lie on

the desk until Friday next to enable other Senators to join in cosponsoring them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the *RECORD*, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KEFAUVER) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

S. 348

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the payment of the estate tax in installments

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subchapter A of chapter 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to place and due date for payment of tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 6157. Installment payments of estate tax.

"(a) Election to make installment payments—

"(1) Payments in 2 to 10 installments: The executor of any estate subject to the tax imposed by chapter 11 may elect to pay the amount of such tax in 2 or more (but not exceeding 10) equal installments.

"(2) Payment in 11 to 20 installments: If the Secretary or his delegate finds that the payment in 10 installments of the tax imposed on any estate by chapter 11 would result in undue hardship to the estate, the executor of such estate may elect to pay the amount of such tax in any number (not exceeding 20) of equal installments as may be approved by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(b) Date for payment of installments: If an election is made under subsection (a), the first installment shall be paid on the date prescribed for payment of the tax by section 6151, and each succeeding installment shall be paid 1 year following the date for payment of the preceding installment.

"(c) Proration of deficiency to installments: If an election has been made under subsection (a) and a deficiency is assessed, the deficiency shall be prorated to the installments remaining unpaid on the date of such assessment, and the part of the deficiency so prorated to each such installment shall be collected at the same time and as a part of such installment.

"(d) Installments paid in advance: At the election of the executor, any installment, or part thereof, under subsection (a) may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment by subsection (b).

"(e) Acceleration of payments: If any installment under subsection (a) is not paid on or before the date prescribed for its payment by subsection (b), the whole of the unpaid tax shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Secretary or his delegate.

"(f) Undue hardship: For purposes of subsection (a) (2) of this section and for purposes of section 6161 (a) (2), there shall be considered to be an undue hardship to an estate in any case in which property comprising 50 percent or more of the value of the gross estate consists of any of the following:

"(1) Capital assets (other than money), or property used in the trade or business, of an unincorporated business enterprise in which the decedent owned a proprietary interest.

"(2) An undivided proprietary interest in a partnership of which the decedent was a partner.

"(3) Stock of a corporation in which the decedent owned (at the time of his death) 10 percent or more of all outstanding stock."

(b) The table of sections for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6157. Installment payments of estate tax."

Sec. 2. Section 6161 of such code (relating to extension of time for paying tax) is amended—

(a) by striking out "10 years" in subsection (a) (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "20 years," and

(b) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e), and inserting after subsection (c) a new subsection as follows:

"(d) Installment payment of estate tax: In any case in which an executor has elected under section 6157 to pay the tax imposed by chapter 11 in installments, subsection (a) (2) shall not apply to the amount determined by the executor as the tax imposed by chapter 11, and subsection (b) shall not apply to the amount determined as a deficiency with respect to any such tax."

Sec. 3. Section 6601 (c) (2) of such code (relating to determination of last date prescribed for payment of tax) is amended by striking out "6152 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "6152 (a) or 6157 (a)", and by striking out "6152 (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "6152 (b) or 6157 (b), as the case may be."

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1956.

S. 349

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain corporations to elect to be taxed as partnerships

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subchapter R of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status) is amended—

(1) by striking out the heading and table of sections for such subchapter and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SUBCHAPTER R—ELECTION OF CERTAIN PARTNERSHIPS, PROPRIETORSHIPS, AND CORPORATIONS AS TO TAXABLE STATUS

"Part I. Alternative taxable status of certain partnerships and proprietorships.

"Part II. Alternative taxable status of certain corporations.

"Part I. Alternative taxable status of certain partnerships and proprietorships

"Sec. 1361. Unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations."; and

(2) by inserting after section 1361 a new part as follows:

"Part II. Alternative taxable status of certain corporations

"Sec. 1371. Certain corporations electing to be treated as partnerships.

"(a) General rule: Subject to the qualifications in subsection (b), a domestic corporation may, not later than 60 days after the close of any taxable year, elect, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to be treated as a partnership for such year and all subsequent years, if all the shareholders owning stock in such corporation at any time on or after the first day of such year and on or before the date of the election consent to the election.

"(b) Qualifications: The election described in subsection (a) may not be made by a domestic corporation unless at all times during the period on or after the first day of the taxable year with respect to which the election is made and on or before the date of election—

"(1) such corporation has — or less shareholders all of whom are individuals (including all partners of any partnership owning stock in such corporation);

"(2) all the shareholders are actively engaged in the conduct of the business of such corporation;

"(3) no shareholder of such corporation is a nonresident alien or a foreign partnership;

"(4) such corporation is not a corporation which was a party to a reorganization described in section 368 (b), or a corporation to which section 355 (or so much of section 356 as relates to section 355) applies and such corporation has not received a distribution under section 332 (relating to liquidations of subsidiaries) except in a case in which the basis of the assets distributed is determined under section 334 (b) (2);

"(5) such corporation has only one class of stock; and

"(6) no more than 80 percent of the stock of such corporation is owned by persons who formerly owned the business of such corporation as an unincorporated enterprise taxable as a domestic corporation under section 1361.

"(c) Partnership provisions applicable.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a domestic corporation making the election under subsection (a) shall be considered a partnership for purposes of this subtitle (except chapter 2 thereof) and shall be subject to subchapter K (sec. 701 and following, relating to partnerships) with respect to formation, operation, distributions, liquidation, sale of an interest, and any other purpose; and each shareholder of such corporation shall be considered a partner owning an interest in the partnership in the proportion which shares owned by such shareholder bear to the total number of outstanding shares of such corporation.

"(d) Election irrevocable.—Except as provided in subsections (e) and (g), the election described in subsection (a) by a domestic corporation shall be irrevocable with respect to—

"(1) the electing corporation and its shareholders; and

"(2) any corporate successor to the business of the electing corporation and the shareholders of such successor.

"(e) Change of ownership.—In the first year in which the shareholders who consented to the election described in subsection (a) own 80 percent or less of the stock of a corporation described in subsection (d), such corporation shall not be treated as a partnership for such year or for subsequent years, unless such corporation makes a new election in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a).

"(f) Constructive ownership.—For purposes of subsections (b) (6) and (e), the ownership of a stock interest shall be determined in accordance with the rules for constructive ownership of stock provided in section 267 (c) other than paragraph (3) thereof.

"(g) Disqualification.—If a corporation described in subsection (d) issues stock of a different class than that outstanding, the election described in subsection (a) shall be deemed never to have been made and the corporation shall be liable for all taxes due (except penalties) and such taxes may be assessed and collected as if no return had been filed.

"(h) Cross reference:

"For period of limitations on assessment and collection of tax where no return has been filed, see section 6501."

(b) Section 1361 (b) of such code (relating to unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph, as follows:

"(5) no proprietor or partners having more than 80 percent interest in the profits

or capital of such enterprise formerly owned stock in a corporation treated as a partnership under section 1371 which carried on the business of such enterprise."

(c) Section 1504 (b) of such code (relating to definition of includible corporation) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph, as follows:

"(8) Corporations subject to tax as partnerships under section 1371."

(d) The table of subchapters for chapter 1 of such code is amended by striking out—

"Subchapter R. Election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Subchapter R. Election of certain partnerships, proprietorships, and corporations as to taxable status."

(e) The amendments made by this act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

S. 350

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the proprietor of an unincorporated business to be treated as an employee under a qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plan

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by inserting after subsection (b) a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Proprietors of unincorporated businesses—

"(1) Treatment as employees: For purposes of this part, an individual who—

"(A) owns a proprietary interest in an unincorporated business enterprise, and

"(B) performs services in the conduct of the trade or business of such business enterprise, which, if performed by an individual who does not own a proprietary interest in such business enterprise, would constitute services performed by an employee,

shall, at his election, be treated as an employee of such business enterprise. Except as provided in paragraph (3), such election shall be irrevocable. Such election shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe.

"(2) Election by partners: In the case of members of a partnership, paragraph (1) shall not apply to any member unless all members who perform services described in paragraph (1) (B) make an election under paragraph (1).

"(3) Change of ownership: An election by a member of a partnership under paragraph (1) shall cease to be effective—

"(A) upon the withdrawal from the partnership of a partner who has made an election under paragraph (1), unless, within 90 days after such withdrawal, the remaining members who perform services described in paragraph (1) (B) make a new election under paragraph (1); or

"(B) upon the addition to the partnership of a new partner who performs services described in paragraph (1) (B), unless, within 90 days after such addition, all partners (including the new partner) who perform services described in paragraph (1) (B) make a new election under paragraph (1).

"(4) Status as employer unaffected: The election by an individual under paragraph (1) to be treated, for purposes of this part, as an employee shall not affect the status of such individual as an employer for purposes of this part or of any other provision of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 1361 (d) of such code (relating to limitation on treatment of certain proprietors as employees) is repealed.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

S. 351

A bill to amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of certain methods and rates of depreciation for used property acquired after 1956

Be it enacted, etc., That section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to depreciation) is amended—

(a) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (c) (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or";

(b) by adding at the end of subsection (c) a new paragraph as follows:

"(3) acquired after December 31, 1956, if the original use of such property does not commence with the taxpayer, and the use of such property by the taxpayer commences after such date."; and

(c) by redesignating subsection (h) as (i), and inserting after subsection (g) a new subsection as follows:

"(h) Limitations with Respect to Used Property:

"(1) Annual limitation: Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) shall apply to property acquired in any taxable year only to the extent that the basis of such property (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition), when added to the basis of all other property described in such paragraph (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition) which is acquired by the taxpayer during the same taxable year, does not exceed \$50,000. This paragraph shall not apply to property acquired by the taxpayer during any taxable year which is included within a 60-month period with respect to which an election under paragraph (2) has been made.

"(2) Five-year limitation: At the election of the taxpayer, paragraph (3) of subsection (c) shall apply to property acquired in any taxable year to the extent that the basis of such property (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition), when added to the basis of all property described in such paragraph (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition) which is acquired by the taxpayer during the 60-month period which includes such taxable year, does not exceed \$250,000. The 60-month period shall begin, with respect to any taxable year, with the first day of the first taxable year for which the taxpayer elects to have the provisions of this paragraph apply. Such election shall be irrevocable, except with the approval of the Secretary or his delegate, and shall be made in such manner and at such time as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall apply only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

S. 352

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on corporations) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Corporations in general: A tax is hereby imposed for each taxable year on the taxable income of every corporation. The tax shall be computed under subsection (b) in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, and under subsection (c) in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956.

"(b) Taxable years beginning before January 1, 1957: In the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, the tax shall consist of—

"(1) a normal tax equal to 30 percent of the taxable income, and

"(2) a surtax equal to 22 percent of the amount by which the taxable income (computed without regard to the deduction, if any, provided in section 242 for partially tax-exempt interest) exceeds \$25,000.

"(c) Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956: In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956, the tax shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

"If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over \$5,000----	5 percent of the taxable income.
Over \$5,000 but not over \$10,000.	\$250, plus 10 percent of excess over \$5,000.
Over \$10,000 but not over \$15,000.	\$750, plus 15 percent of excess over \$10,000.
Over \$15,000 but not over \$20,000.	\$1,500, plus 25 percent of excess over \$15,000.
Over \$20,000 but not over \$25,000.	\$2,750, plus 35 percent of excess over \$20,000.
Over \$25,000 but not over \$100,000.	\$4,500, plus 45 percent of excess over \$25,000.
Over \$100,000-----	\$38,250, plus 55 percent of excess over \$100,000."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 12 (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (cross references relating to tax on corporations) is amended by striking out "section 11 (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 11 (b) (2)."

(b) Section 244 (2) (B) of such Code (relating to dividends received on certain preferred stock) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11, in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income), in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956."

(c) Section 247 (a) (2) (B) of such Code (relating to dividends paid on certain preferred stock of public utilities) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11 in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956."

(d) Section 511 (a) (1) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on unrelated business income of charitable and so forth, organizations) is amended by striking out "a normal tax and a surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax."

(e) (1) Sections 802 (a) and 802 (c) (2) (A) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on life-insurance companies) are amended by striking out "a normal tax (computed under section 11 (b) and a surtax (computed under section 11 (c))" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax (computed under section 11)."

(2) Section 811 (a) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on life-insurance companies) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Tax imposed: A tax (computed under section 11) is hereby imposed on the life-

insurance company taxable income of every life-insurance company for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956."

(f) Section 852 (b) (1) of such Code (relating to taxation of regulated investment companies and their shareholders) is amended (1) by striking out "normal tax and surtax" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "tax," (2) by striking out "a normal tax and surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax," and (3) by striking out "the normal tax under section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tax under section 11 (but only the normal tax under such section in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957)."

(g) Section 922 (2) (B) of such Code (relating to special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11, in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income) in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956."

(h) Section 1361 (h) (1) of such Code (relating to imposition of taxes on unincorporated business enterprises electing to be treated as domestic corporations) is amended by striking out "the normal tax and surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tax."

(i) Section 1503 (a) of such Code (relating to computation and payment of tax on consolidated returns) is amended (1) by striking out "tax imposed under section 11 (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "surtax imposed under section 11," and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of the first sentence of this subsection, the term 'surtax imposed by section 11' means (1) the tax imposed by section 11 (b) (2), in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957, and (2) that portion of the tax imposed by section 11 (c) which is attributable to taxable income exceeding \$25,000, in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956."

(j) Section 1551 of such code (relating to disallowance of surtax exemption and accumulated earnings credit) is amended by striking out "provided in section 11 (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "provided (in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1957) in section 11 (b) (2)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the United States Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman, has been conducting hearings and investigations on the problem of juvenile delinquency for the past several years. Our investigations have gone into the many facets of juvenile delinquency and special youth problems among the Indians, the Territories, and the District of Columbia, which are under the special jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. During this 85th Congress our subcommittee will submit bills which we believe will aid in the fight against juvenile delinquency in this country. These bills will cover the many aspects of the juvenile-

delinquency problem which come under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States and are beyond the police powers of the several States.

This morning, on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a series of juvenile-delinquency bills: First, a bill to amend section 7 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, which will provide that the Director of Social Work shall carry out his duties and functions in accordance with the policies and procedures established by the juvenile court judge. We believe this amendment will materially aid in the administration of justice in juvenile-delinquency matters; second, a bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia. This bill will provide additional police powers in eradicating the distribution, publication, and sale of indecent publications in the District of Columbia by permitting the confiscation of equipment used; and, third, a bill to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia. This bill provides for the appointment of a referee to aid the juvenile court judge in hearing juvenile-delinquency cases.

We urge the immediate consideration and passage of these bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Senator KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

S. 355. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia;

S. 356. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia," so as to provide for the appointment of a referee; and

S. 357. A bill to amend section 7 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE TREATYMAKING POWER

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the various sections of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanation, presented by Mr. BRICKER, is as follows:

TEXT OF PROPOSED TREATY-CONTROL AMENDMENT AND ACCOMPANYING STATEMENT

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement not made in pursuance of this Constitution shall have no force or effect. This section shall not apply to treaties made prior to the effective date of this Constitution.

"Sec. 2. A treaty or other international agreement shall have legislative effect within the United States as a law thereof only through legislation, except to the extent that the Senate shall provide affirmatively, in its resolution advising and consenting to a treaty, that the treaty shall have legislative effect.

"Sec. 3. An international agreement other than a treaty shall have legislative effect within the United States as a law thereof only through legislation valid in the absence of such an international agreement.

"Sec. 4. On the question of advising and consenting to a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the Senators voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate."

SECTION 1

Section 1 would in nowise impair the well-recognized constitutional treaty making power with respect to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and other nations, nor the constitutional authority of the President to conduct the foreign affairs of the United States.

In *Asakura v. Seattle*, 265 U. S. 332, 341, the Supreme Court said:

"The treaty-making power of the United States is not limited by any express provision of the Constitution, and, though it does not extend 'so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids,' it does extend to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and other nations."

In *Geofroy v. Riggs*, 133 U. S. 258, 266, the Supreme Court said:

"The treaty power of the United States extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and the governments of other nations."

It is also firmly established that the treaty-making power is vested solely in the national government to the exclusion of the States.

Section 1, however, would give effect to what the Supreme Court has said by way of dicta, and therefore not authoritatively, in a number of decisions that a provision of a treaty or other international agreement which violates the Constitution, or which undertakes to do what the Constitution forbids, or which is inconsistent with the nature of our Government or the relation between the States and the United States, would be invalid.

See *The Cherokee Tobacco*, 11 Wall. 616, 620-621; *Holden v. Joy*, 17 Wall. 211, 243; *Geofroy v. Riggs*, supra, and *Asakura v. Seattle*, supra.

The opinion of the Supreme Court in *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U. S. 416, contains the following dictum:

"Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States. It is open to question whether the authority of the United States means more than the formal acts prescribed to make the convention."

Since it is a settled rule that in construing statutory and constitutional provisions the instrument should be considered as a whole, it is necessary to negate that dictum. Section 1 does this and would prevent a construction that although a treaty conflicts with the Constitution, such conflict is

neutralized by the supreme law provision of article VI with respect to treaties.

The phrase, "not made in pursuance of this Constitution," is employed because it is the language of the present Constitution and has a well-defined and settled meaning. The phrase means that an international agreement must conform to, and not conflict with, the Constitution.

Examples of the effect of section 1 are: a treaty would be invalid if it undertook to impair freedom of speech, press, or religion; and a treaty would be invalid if it undertook to take private property without due process of law and just compensation.

A treaty would be open to challenge on the ground that it dealt with a subject having no legitimate relation to matters of international concern or foreign affairs and dealt with matters of purely domestic concern. That would be using a treaty as a subterfuge to enact domestic law.

Neither section 1 nor section 2 embraces the so-called "which clause." The power of Congress to implement a valid treaty by legislation under the "necessary and proper clause" would remain unimpaired.

Of course, an invalid treaty could not bring into being legislative power under the "necessary and proper clause."

SECTION 2

Section 2 does not affect the self-executing provisions of a treaty or other international agreement as a binding contract between the governments which are parties thereto.

The contractual effect and the legal consequences which flow from a treaty or other international agreement as a binding contract would not be limited. However, if a treaty or other international agreement is to have legislative effect, as distinguished from its effect as a contract between the States parties thereto, it must be implemented by legislative enactment.

With regard to earlier drafts of an amendment concerning the treaty power, the requirement that treaties be implemented by legislation in order to be effective as domestic law (as is the case in most other countries) provoked the argument that sometimes where implementing legislation is required for a treaty, it might take so long to get the legislation as to prove internationally embarrassing.

To meet this criticism under section 2 when immediate legislative effect of a treaty is deemed necessary, the Senate at the time of consenting to the treaty can, if a sufficient case is made, provide affirmatively that it should have immediate legislative effect.

Under section 2 most treaties would be implemented by Congress, while others might require implementation by State legislation.

Examples in the latter category are the French treaty of 1853 involved in *Geofroy v. Riggs*, 133 U. S. 258, 268, and treaties with China made in 1946, and with Italy made in 1948 and with Denmark, Greece, Israel, Ethiopia and Japan made in 1953, portions of which were made dependent for their domestic effect in the United States upon conformity with State law then existing or thereafter enacted, in respect of such matters as ownership of real and personal property and engaging in business.

In *United States v. Pink*, 315 U. S. 203, 230 (1942), the Court said:

"Frequently the obligation of a treaty will be dependent on State law."

SECTION 3

Section 2 above deals with the need for legislation to make treaties or other international agreements effective as domestic law within the United States. Section 3 embodies constitutional limitations with respect to legislation which implements international agreements other than treaties.

Section 3 does incorporate the "which clause" with respect to international agreements other than treaties. Section 2 recognizes that a treaty ratified by the Senate would bring into being legislative power by Congress to implement the treaty under the "necessary and proper clause," notwithstanding it would have no authority to enact such legislation in the absence of the treaty. However, it is thought that the President, acting alone, by entering into an executive agreement should not have authority to bring into being legislative power which would not otherwise exist.

Here again, it should be kept in mind that section 3 does not affect the international agreement as a contract or the legal consequences that flow from its contractual provisions. It only limits the general legislative effect, absent implementing legislation, and contains the "which clause."

SECTION 4

The distinguished minority leader, Senator KNOWLAND, is responsible for the language to prevent treaties from being approved by only a handful of Senators present and voting. Both the administration and I have endorsed Senator KNOWLAND's contribution to the amendment. On February 16, 1954, the Senate approved this provision by a vote of 72 to 16.

EFFECT, RETROACTIVE OF PROSPECTIVE, OF SECTIONS 1, 2, 3, AND 4

Section 1 is intended to be prospective and also retroactive to the effective date of the original Constitution. Of course, under well-established legal principles, the retroactive effect of this section would not apply to treaties or provisions thereof already fully performed, nor to rights or interests established by final adjudication under prior treaties.

Section 2, as drawn, is intended to be prospective in operation only, as shown by the clause beginning "except to." It is not intended to require any legislation not otherwise required, with respect to treaties that become operative prior to the effective date of section 2.

Section 3 is intended to be prospective in operation only.

Section 4 is prospective only.

TEMPORARY COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY CONDITIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for the establishment of a temporary commission to investigate highway safety traffic conditions on interstate highways.

This is a subject which concerns the hearts and minds of all of us. In view of the tremendous number of fatal and near-fatal accidents on the highways, and also in view of the number of new highways being built with Federal assistance, I believe that at this time such a study by a Federal commission is very wise and practical; and I hope that ultimately the Senate will pass the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) providing for the establishment of a temporary commission to investigate highway traffic safety conditions, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

TRANSFER OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR YELLOWTAIL DAM AND RESERVOIR AND PAYMENT TO CROW TRIBE IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution "to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin Unit, Missouri River Basin Project and Payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith and for other purposes."

Co-sponsors, with me, of this joint resolution are five distinguished Members of the Senate: My colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The joint resolution is designed to pave the way to start construction of Yellowtail Dam and powerplant on the Wyoming-Montana border. The project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The Congress has appropriated funds to start construction, but we in Montana are unwilling for work to go ahead until the right-of-way problem is settled to the satisfaction of the Crow Indian Tribe on whose land the dam and part of the reservoir are located.

In the 84th Congress, the Senate, without a dissenting vote, passed Senate Joint Resolution 135, to pay the Crow Indians \$5 million for the dam and reservoir right-of-way. The House concurred in the passage of the resolution by a recorded vote.

President Eisenhower vetoed the resolution on grounds that indicate that he was not in possession of all the facts and precedents that justified the Congress in providing \$5 million in connection with Yellowtail Dam right-of-way. The resolution we are introducing today, and the supporting data we shall present, are designed to meet the President's objections to Senate Joint Resolution 135.

In addition to payment for the actual value of the land required for the right-of-way, the new resolution recognizes "special values" in support of a \$5 million payment to the Crow Indians.

The resolution is identical with House Joint Resolution No. 2, introduced January 3 by Representative LEROY ANDERSON, of the Second Montana District. Early hearings will be held by the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses.

A similar resolution will be introduced in the House by Representative LEE METCALF, of the First Montana District.

We shall show at public hearings to be held soon that the Crow Indian Tribe is fully entitled to \$5 million in connection with the transfer of the right-of-way and related factors. The Crow Indians are entitled to fair and just treatment.

In the last hundred years their reservation area in Montana and Wyoming has been reduced from 38.5 million to about 2 million acres. This is about 5 percent of the reservation area in 1851.

We shall also show that practically all of the payment to the Crow Indians will

be returned to the Federal Treasury, with interest from power revenues paid by consumers in Montana, Wyoming, and elsewhere in the Missouri River Basin. Therefore, the payment will not be a drain on the taxpayers of the country.

It is significant to note that the Federal agencies require non-Federal power projects to pay Indians elsewhere for the lease of land for dam and power sites at rates which would exceed the proposed Crow figure. This is true in the case of the Flathead Indian Tribes in western Montana and the Warm Springs Indians in Oregon. In both instances, the Federal Power Commission and the Secretary of the Interior, acting for the Federal Government, approved these high payments.

In other words, power installations and productions represent the established basic criteria for dealing with Indians elsewhere. This resolution merely proposes that the Crow Indians be treated on a similar basis.

In my opinion, the Federal agencies that opposed the \$5 million payment in Senate Joint Resolution 135, passed by Congress last May, failed to advise President Eisenhower of the precedents established by Interior and the Federal Power Commission.

All of these facts will again be brought out in the RECORD so that the Congress and the President may be fully advised of all the facts and circumstances that justify the payment of \$5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe in connection with the Yellowtail Dam right-of-way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in the introduction of the Senate joint resolution "to provide for the transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes."

In essence, this resolution provides for the payment to the Crow Indian Tribe of Montana the sum of \$5 million for the right-of-way lands, together with special values and other justifiable considerations in connection therewith.

I call the attention of the Senate to the preamble to the resolution, which I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The preamble calls attention to the veto message of the President, dated June 7, 1956, when he returned without ap-

proval Senate Joint Resolution 135, which was passed by the 84th Congress in May of last year. Pertinent paragraphs from the President's message are included in the preamble for the information of the Senate.

Needless to say, we do not concur with the basis for the President's refusal to approve Senate Joint Resolution 135. Unfortunately, it appears, doubtless through oversight, that the President's advisers on this matter did not place him in possession of all of the facts and circumstances in connection with the justification for the payment of \$5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe for the surrender of its rights to the land required for the construction and operation of Yellowtail Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant on the Big Horn River in Montana and Wyoming.

As set forth in the resolution, there are special values and other justifiable considerations that make the payment of \$5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe a sound investment for the United States in connection with the Yellowtail Dam development.

Montana, the Missouri River Basin, and the entire country needs Yellowtail Dam for its water conservation, flood control, irrigation storage, river regulation, and power production. It is a vital development of natural resources that has been endorsed by the Congress of the United States, not only through its authorization in the Flood Control Act of 1944, but through the appropriation of \$4 million to initiate its construction.

The record shows, as set forth in the preamble to the resolution, that the Crow Indian Tribe has been most cooperative with the Federal Government in connection with development of the West. At the time of the treaty of September 17, 1851, the Crow Indian Reservation included 38.5 million acres of land in Montana and Wyoming, which was made up of exceedingly valuable grazing and other agricultural lands, with vast timber and mineral resources. Through various treaties and acts of Congress, the reservation has been reduced to approximately 2 million acres, or about 5 percent of the area fixed by the treaty of 1851. Last year, the Crow Indian Tribe voted to accept \$5 million in connection with the transfer to the United States of the right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam.

The resolution, as my distinguished colleague has stated, sets forth precedents under which agencies of the Federal Government have required private power companies to pay compensation for special values in connection with the lease, for 50 years, of Indian lands required for non-Federal power developments. In the case of the Crow Indian Tribe, at the Yellowtail Dam site, it is proposed that title to the land be transferred to the United States.

In its major features, the resolution introduced today is essentially in terms agreed to by the Crow Indian Tribal Council in resolutions adopted last year. In addition, the Crow Indian Tribal Council officers telegraphed the President on May 29, 1956, urging him to sign Senate Joint Resolution 135 into law.

We expect to bring out in full all of the facts and circumstances in connection with this resolution at public hearings, and to demonstrate that the payment of \$5 million is fully justified by the circumstances set forth in the preamble to the resolution.

I trust that early hearings will be held, so that the Crow Indians may be paid the \$5 million, and that construction of Yellowstone Dam can be gotten underway promptly, so that public power production and other conservation developments in connection with the project may be speedily advanced.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the preamble of a copy of the Senate joint resolution, which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the preamble of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the 84th Congress, 1st session, adopted Senate Joint Resolution 135 providing "for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowstone Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming," to which reference is hereby made; and

Whereas on June 7, 1956, the President returned said resolution, "without my approval," with comment which included the following:

"In essence, this resolution culminates a decade of negotiation and disagreement between the Department of the Interior and the Crow Indians with respect to the amount of compensation to be paid to the tribe for lands required for the Yellowstone Dam and Reservoir, for which the initial construction appropriation was made in the fiscal year 1956 and for which an additional \$10,850,000 was included in the budget for the fiscal year 1957.

"The standard of payment for land acquired by the Government is 'just compensation,' or 'fair market value.' However, I recognize that, as a matter of policy, the Federal Government has made awards in excess of 'just compensation' in other cases involving Indian lands. If the Congress determines that it wishes to provide for an extra payment in this case, it should not be done under the claim that it is 'just compensation.' The amount, the method for computing it, and the equitable justification for it, should be clearly established on acceptable premises. Neither the resolution nor the legislative history does this.

"A statutory settlement of this kind of controversy might be acceptable if soundly and equitably premised and if it reflected a substantial measure of agreement between parties to the dispute. I regret that the extravagant nature of the award contemplated by Senate Joint Resolution 135 requires this action which may cause some additional delay in proceeding with the construction of the Yellowstone unit. It is my hope that the Congress can approve a statutory settlement which will permit expeditious action to proceed with the construction of this much-needed project,"; and

Whereas, as established by treaty of September 17, 1851, with the United States Government, the acreage of the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana and Wyoming included an area of 38½ million acres of land, including valuable grazing and other agricultural lands, as well as vast timber and mineral resources; and

Whereas, subsequently after the treaty of May 7, 1868, the act of Congress of April 21, 1882 (22 Stat. 42); the act of Congress of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 989); the act of Congress of April 27, 1904 (33 Stat. 352); and the act of Congress of August 31, 1937 (50 Stat.

884), and subsequent adjustments between allotted, unallotted, and reserved lands, the Crow Indian Reservation (now confined to a part of one county in Montana) has been reduced without just compensation to 2,018,218 acres, or to approximately 5 percent of the area fixed by the treaty of September 17, 1851; and

Whereas the Crow Indians, by a majority vote of its tribal council through resolution No. 63, adopted January 11, 1955, showed its willingness to cooperate in advancing the construction of Yellowstone Dam as a multiple-purpose development as a part of the Missouri River Basin system for flood control, river regulation, irrigation storage, and hydroelectric power production by a further surrender of a valuable part of the remaining reservation; and

Whereas, by telegram dated May 29, 1956, the duly elected officers of the Crow Indian Tribal Council withdrew opposition to said Senate Joint Resolution 135 and urged the President to sign said resolution into law; and

Whereas the Congress has repeatedly shown its willingness and readiness to recognize cooperation by Indian tribes in advancing resource development through multiple-purpose projects such as Yellowstone Dam; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission and the Department of the Interior have approved awards to Indian tribes in connection with hydroelectric power developments by non-Federal agencies in at least two transactions, where special values and justifiable considerations were essential factors (to the Flathead Indians in western Montana and to the Warm Spring Indians in Oregon where Indian lands for power-site purposes are leased at rates which in 50 years yield proportionately more than proposed in this resolution); and

Whereas said amounts of special values and considerations in connection with Yellowstone Dam will be repaid to the Federal Treasury through power revenues paid by power consumers of the Missouri River Basin power system; and

Whereas facts and circumstances are available to support the special values and other justifiable considerations and thereby meet the objections set forth in the President's message of June 7, 1956.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1957, General Pulaski Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. President, under the terms of the joint resolution the President would be directed to call upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11 and to invite the people of the United States to observe that day in churches and schools.

This year we commemorate the 177th anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish patriot who gave his life for our country during our fight for its freedom. During the past few months the world has again witnessed the great devotion of the Polish people to freedom. Their heroic rebellion against the yoke of Communist tyranny earned for the people of Poland the respect and compassion of the entire free world. In the light of their dra-

matic fight for freedom, I think it particularly fitting that we commemorate the anniversary of General Pulaski's death.

The zeal and sacrifice exemplified by General Pulaski in defense of our country gives inspiration to those who keep alive the spirit of freedom not only in Poland but in all oppressed countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Let us take time this year to pay tribute to this great Polish patriot—Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski—who lived and died in the cause of freedom.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1957, General Pulaski Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a joint congressional Committee on Scientific Research.

In view of the prominent position achieved by the United States in the fields of science and industry, it is my feeling that the continued scientific development is essential to our industrial strength and national defense. In this respect, the Congress should be in a position to maintain current information on all aspects of this country's scientific development in order that it may more intelligently legislate means of eliminating shortages of scientists and engineers, and to promote our further scientific development.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 17) to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS CONNECTED WITH ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution which provides for the creation of a temporary joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President from the time of their nomination until the termination of their terms of office. The purpose of the contemplated study is to achieve a sound basis for such remedial legislation as may be necessary to make the laws certain and complete as to the presidential election, succession, and duties.

The resolution is similar to those I have submitted in each Congress during the past 11 years. Three times my proposals received Senate approval—in 1946, 1949, and 1956—but failed final action in the House. My zeal for the establishment of a joint committee of Congress to study the problems of presidential succession in its broadest aspects has not waned with these disappointments. In fact, I believe that the constitutional questions and legal problems involved become more acute with each passing year. We can ill afford further delay in reaching their determination. For the good of the country, I hope the resolution I now submit will receive the prompt approval of both Houses of the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), submitted by Mr. GREEN, was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Concurrent resolution

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of 5 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and 5 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President from the time of the nomination of the President and Vice President, through the time of their election and time of their inauguration until the termination of their respective terms of office, with the purpose of making the law certain and complete as to the presidential election, succession, and duties. These matters shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

I. As to the election of the President and Vice President—

(1) Whether or not candidates for President and Vice President should be nominated by national political conventions, as at present, and, if so, recommendations which should be made to the parties for improving the convention process, and, if not, a method which would be preferable.

(2) Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college, as at present, and if so whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

(3) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where before the election of presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the Presidency or for the Vice Presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

(4) Whether or not provision should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon it.

(5) Whether or not a constitutional amendment should be proposed under which failure of candidates for President and Vice President to receive a majority of the electoral votes shall be resolved by popular vote rather than by the House of Representatives.

II. As to succession to the office of President—

(1) Whether the provisions of Public Law 199 of the 80th Congress, approved July 18, 1947, relating to Presidential succession, adequately provide for all possible contingencies, occasioned by the removal, resignation, death, or inability of both the President and the Vice President.

(2) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and of any other individual succeeding to the office of President.

(3) Whether or not the term of the Vice President or other individual succeeding to the Presidency should be limited to a duration of approximately 2 years, a new presidential election to coincide with election of Members of the House of Representatives where such individual succeeds to the Presidency during the first or second year of the term for which the President was elected.

III. As to inability of the President to discharge his powers and duties—

(1) How it shall be determined whether the President is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office; and how the extent and duration of such inability shall be determined and defined.

(2) How it shall be decided that the inability requires the constitutional discharge by the Vice President of the powers and duties of the office of President, or results in the succession of the Vice President to the office of President.

(3) What provision should be made to determine a similar inability affecting the Vice President, or other individual, acting during the inability of the President.

(4) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and of any other individual executing the powers and duties of the office of President, during a period of temporary Presidential inability.

IV. As to the powers and duties of the President—

(1) Whether the heavy burdens of the Presidency necessitate the creation of an office of Executive Vice President; whether the establishment of such an office requires a constitutional amendment; and what powers and duties of the President should be assigned to such office.

(2) Whether the act of October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 712), which provided generally for the delegation of Presidential functions should be modified or extended.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, including drafts of any legislation recommended and of any proposed constitutional amendments considered necessary or desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1957, and thereupon the existence of the joint committee shall terminate.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ counsel, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

STANDARD OF LIVING OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Concurrent resolution

Whereas it is the understanding of Congress that its responsibility in the American Indian problem cannot be fulfilled by the dispersal of Indian communities, but by the continuous development of their human and economic potential; and

Whereas it is recognized that Indian communities cannot be considered to have reached the American level of well-being until the principles of consent of the governed, self-determination, and local self-government are operative, nor until Indian opportunities in economy, education, and health are measurably equal to those of their fellow citizens; and

Whereas the American "point 4 program," as it has been applied successfully in underdeveloped areas of the world, reveals tested techniques whereby American Indian communities may be so developed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be, by definition, an agency to assist American Indian communities to reach the level of well-being enjoyed by other communities in the United States, and the governing program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be an American Indian point 4 program.

It is declared to be the sense of Congress that this program shall be offered to the American Indian communities without exacting termination of Federal protection of Indian property or of any other Indian rights as its price; that Indian culture and identity shall not be restricted or destroyed; that technical guidance and financial assistance shall be made available; that the request for assistance shall come from the Indians themselves after each Indian group has studied itself in terms of its own needs; that an impartial effort shall be made to deal with the development of natural resources to maximum capacity, to develop the full capabilities of industrial and agricultural production, of improvements in housing, nutrition, clothing, sanitation, and health, and of the resettlement on their initiative of individuals and families in other areas; that technical assistance shall be given to long-term general, vocational, technical, and professional education to enable American Indians to share fully in our total American society and to contribute to it; and that older, revered values shall be respected and used as new forms of living are introduced.

It is further declared to be the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Interior shall review all programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in order to develop its activities to further an American Indian point 4 program, and that he shall report to Congress at the earliest possible date his recommendations for such legislation as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

Finally, it is declared to be the sense of Congress that Federal protection and services shall be ended for any tribe, band, or group only when such unit shall have adopted a plan for its organization and operation under State law, and such plan shall have been approved by the appropriate State and by the Secretary of the Interior prior to its submission to the Congress.

INVESTIGATION OF METHODS OF INCREASING HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 12) which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States. In making such investigation and study the committee shall give consideration to—

(1) the need for Federal assistance to State and local governments in the enforcement of necessary highway safety and speed requirements and the forms such assistance should take;

(2) the advisability and practicability of uniform State and local highway safety and speed laws and what steps should be taken by the Federal Government to promote the adoption of such uniform laws;

(3) possible means of promoting highway safety in the manufacture of the various types of vehicles used on the highways;

(4) educational programs to promote highway safety; and

(5) such other matters as it may deem advisable and appropriate.

The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR RACKETEERING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in keeping with a statement which I made late in the last session of the Congress, I am resubmitting today a resolution providing for an investigation of labor racketeering by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or by a subcommittee thereof.

I recognize that, since the submission of the similar resolution last July 5, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has done much preliminary work in this field. The staff of that subcommittee has produced a considerable amount of material which will be of great value in any overall investigation which is authorized by the Senate.

Despite this valuable activity by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, I feel strongly that the entire subject of racketeering in organized labor lies squarely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Labor racketeering affects the whole field of labor-management relations; it also affects directly the public welfare, which is endangered so long as racketeering exists.

It is in line with this thinking that I am submitting again a resolution which would give to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the funds necessary to carry out an investigation of labor racketeering.

I find it difficult to express how strongly I feel the necessity for such an investigation. Racketeers intimidate honest workers and pervert the purpose of the labor movement. They add incalculably to the cost of doing business, and thereby to the price paid by consumers.

They flout their government and make a mockery of its duty to preserve law and order.

In my opinion, only the Congress has the power to deal with this nationwide problem in the vigorous and comprehensive manner required. Undoubtedly the investigation which I have proposed would lead in time to recommendations from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee for strengthening the Federal law regarding racketeering. I am certain that the law needs strengthening.

It is regrettable, but true, that an investigation of this nature will have difficulty in avoiding charges that it is baiting labor or bringing politics into labor-management relations. We are dealing here, however, with a subject which is far too serious to permit any maneuvering for political advantage or any attempt to persecute labor.

I made a promise when I submitted the similar resolution last year, and I should like to renew it now. As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I shall do all that is within my power to make certain that this investigation, if it is authorized, shall be conducted without partisanship and with scrupulous fairness to labor organizations, employers and other interested parties.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], I submit the resolution for appropriate reference.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) providing for an investigation of labor racketeering by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or by a subcommittee thereof, submitted by Mr. IVES, for himself and Mr. PURTELL, was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study and investigation of the penetration of criminal elements into, and their influence on, organized labor in the United States, for the purpose of ascertaining whether legislation is necessary for the protection of labor organizations, employees, employers, and the general public. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$250,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INFILTRATION OF CRIMINALS, ETC., INTO THE FIELD OF ORGANIZED LABOR

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution providing funds and authority to conduct an urgently needed investigation of such magnitude that it requires additional funds beyond those ordinarily needed for the general functions of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

This investigation involves the infiltration of criminals and hoodlums and

dishonest elements into the field of organized labor. May I say at the outset, it is not the intention of my committee or its subcommittee to infringe on the authority or jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, nor is it the intention of the committee to interfere with legitimate union activities. We seek only to help legitimate unions to function without the interference and influence of criminals and hoodlums.

Although our investigation may touch on some aspects of labor law, it concerns itself primarily and to a larger degree with such matters as Government procurement, Government operations, violations of our tax laws, interference with interstate commerce, and violations of criminal laws, and the failure to file the full and complete financial records under Public Law 101, 80th Congress.

We do not intend to examine into labor matters such as wages and hours regulations, regulations affecting labor disputes, or other purely labor functions.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations, as its name implies, involves an examination into the operation of all branches of the Government. I wish to point out that the scope of this investigation is broader than merely matters pertaining to the Department of Labor.

Without seeking to disparage any other committee, I feel that the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, by reason of the long experience and efficiency of its staff, is the best equipped to conduct this type of investigation.

For the past 4 months, a majority of the staff of the subcommittee has been engaged in a preliminary investigation in New York City, Chicago, Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, and other areas, and has uncovered specific evidences of collusion between dishonest employers and union officials, extortions, the use of violence by certain segments of labor leadership, the diversion and misuse of labor union funds by high-ranking dishonest union officials for their own profit and gain, and large-scale frauds in income taxes.

Furthermore, for the past 2 years, this committee has been studying Army procurement matters which involve collusion between dishonest contractors and criminals who have managed to seize control of certain unions.

The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations as early as last May 17 and May 29 held executive hearings and brought before it such well-known criminals as the notorious John Dioguardia, alias Johnny Dio; his brother, Tommy Dioguardia; Albert Anastasia, notorious as one of the gunmen of Murder, Inc., and reputed to be involved in a large number of unsolved murders; Harry Stromberg, Joseph Profaci, and James Plumeri, all well-known underworld characters who were either directly or indirectly connected with the pattern of underworld control of unions and the dishonest contracting firms acting in collusion with labor fronts.

The investigation into these hoodlum activities has broadened into a nationwide investigation into similar racketeer controls over unions, whose activities, if

left unexposed and unchecked, will have an impact not only on Government procurement, but may seriously impair the efficiency, economy, and the operation of Government.

In one instance we have evidence indicating that dishonest teamster officers sought to use their union power to take over the control of the municipal government for the purpose of controlling vice, including gambling and prostitution.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks, a letter which I received from the city council of Portland, Oreg., formally requesting that my committee investigate this matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

CITY OF PORTLAND, OREG.,
December 21, 1956.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Investigations Subcommittee
of Governmental Operations
Committee, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: As auditor of the city of Portland, Oreg., I have been directed by the city council, the governing body of the city of Portland, to extend to your investigations subcommittee an invitation to hold, here in Portland, your current investigations concerning activities of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and vice conditions in the Pacific Northwest. The council of the city of Portland approved this invitation as a result of discussion concerning newspaper reports of possible delays to the committee in examining records and reports, and approved the view that: An investigation hearing held in Portland, Oreg., would minimize delays to the committee; would permit city and State officials to testify as the committee may desire and supply their records to the committee as it may request, with greater facility; and, would afford to the 13,000 members of the teamsters' union in the greater Portland area, a wider knowledge of organization operations.

I am further directed by the city council to assure you and the committee that, if the committee so desires, it may have the use of the city council chambers with recording equipment for use of the committee, and that the city of Portland will make available to the committee the facilities of the bureau of police of the city of Portland, insofar as the committee may desire to use such facilities, and will offer the full cooperation of the city of Portland.

Yours respectfully,

WILL GIBSON,
Auditor of the City of Portland.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I also ask to insert in the *RECORD* an article which appeared only yesterday, January 6, 1957, in the New York Times, entitled "Labor Union Rackets a Continuing Problem," by A. H. Raskin. I do not wish to burden the Senate by reading the entire article, although I consider it well informed and pertinent.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 6, 1957]

LABOR-UNION RACKETS A CONTINUING PROBLEM—AFL-CIO TAKES UP TWO CASES BUT IS POWERLESS IN OTHERS

(By A. H. Raskin)

The united labor movement is determined to resort to major surgery, if necessary, to

rid itself of cancerous growths of gangster penetration.

George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, made this clear last week in suspending the heads of two small unions, accused of unethical conduct and welfare-fund abuses.

The get-tough policy toward union racketeering will receive added emphasis when the AFL-CIO executive council meets in Miami Beach on January 28 for its midwinter meeting. The council is expected to give its blessing to preparation of what would amount to a 10 commandments of honorable practice for union officials. This would take the form of a code designed to prevent unionists from using their labor posts for personal profit.

How much corruption there is in the 15-million-member federation is not susceptible of statistical measurement. Many of the largest unions—the United Automobile Workers, the United Steelworkers, and the International Association of Machinists, to name three in the million-member class—are almost completely free of underworld elements. Scores of the smaller unions are similarly without blemish.

RACKETEERING SURVIVES

But their good record is obscured by the predatory tactics of crooked officials in a relatively small number of strategic unions that deal with thousands of small and medium-sized businesses. Involved in a constant competitive struggle for survival, the small employer is often powerless to resist the extortions of union racketeers. Sometimes, it must be added, he not only does not resist but actively seeks the aid of unsavory forces to defeat legitimate union demands or to win some other business advantage for himself.

The greatest racket inroads have been made in trucking, waterfront activities and in a multiplicity of service, construction, distributive, and manufacturing trades. No one has any real idea of the annual "take," but the freedom with which the heads of tiny unions fling around money at plush hotels, night clubs, race tracks, and other gambling establishments makes it clear that labor piracy is not in the petty larceny class. Diverted fees from welfare funds alone run to many millions a year.

MAIN OBSTACLE

The chief obstacle to a gigantic broom-wielding job by the parent federation is the ability of the crooks to hide behind the self-governing rights of the international unions in which they hold sway. Under the AFL-CIO constitution, the only unions that are within the direct administrative rule of the federation itself are the so-called Federal labor unions and local industrial unions.

These are single-unit unions unattached to any national industrial or craft organization. There are 900 of them, scattered through every State, and they have a combined membership of about 250,000. It was against two unions in this group that Mr. Meany directed his crackdown last week.

One was a local of 900 Chicago junk handlers and the other was made up of 1,750 workers in Philadelphia can factories. Trustees were put in charge of their funds, offices, and records, and the suspended secretaries-treasurers of the two organizations were called to hearings in the AFL-CIO headquarters in Washington tomorrow.

However, the task is far harder in the international unions, which comprise 98 percent of the federation's enrollment. The 140 unions in this category range from the Horse Shoers Union with 246 members, to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, which pays per capita dues on 1,300,000. These unions hold charters that make them sovereign over their own affairs.

POSSIBLE SUSPENSION

The federation's only recourse if the internationals refuse to correct conditions that bring discredit on the entire movement is to suspend or expel them. Three relatively small internationals already face the possibility that this amputation process will be practiced on them. They are the Laundry Workers, the Distillery Workers, and the Allied Industrial Workers, with a joint membership of 170,000. The AFL-CIO ethical practices committee will submit recommendations to the Miami Beach meeting on whether to suspend their charters for welfare-fund maladministration.

The leaders directly involved in the abuses now under investigation by the merged organization are in the small-fry class in terms of the economic importance of their unions. But the high command of the AFL-CIO is becoming increasingly convinced that there is an interlocking directorate of crime operating within labor. Crooks in west coast unions are on remarkably intimate terms with those on the east coast. The same comradely spirit is manifest at all way stations.

RACKET UPSURGE

The imminence of an upsurge of racket power in the New York trucking industry has sharpened the resolve of Mr. Meany and his associates to act decisively in areas where the normal processes of law-enforcement appear of little effect. The retirement of Martin T. Lacey as president of the Teamsters Joint Council here opens the way for control of trucking by the same elements that have dominated the docks for many years.

In 1953 the old A. F. of L., under Mr. Meany's leadership, kicked out the International Longshoremen's Association. Now the men of the Teamsters Union who were most active in helping the pier union keep its stranglehold on the port will have a commanding grip on the city's trucking. This is a prospect that is as unpalatable to labor's top echelon as it is to District Attorney Frank S. Hogan or United States Attorney Paul W. Williams. Whether labor can deal with it more successfully than the public prosecutors remains to be seen. Up to now the tide has been running strongly in the underworld's favor.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I quote from this article very briefly:

The greatest racket inroads have been made in trucking, waterfront activities, and in a multiplicity of service, construction, distributive and manufacturing trades. No one has any real idea of the annual "take," . . .

. . . the high command of the AFL-CIO is becoming increasingly convinced that there is an interlocking directorate of crime operating within labor. Crooks in west coast unions are on remarkably intimate terms with those on the east coast.

Not the least important is that this committee has been engaged for many years in investigating frauds and other illegal practices which have been perpetrated on the Government in its procurement and building programs.

The Government is about to embark on a vast, long-range road building program which will entail the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Too often in the past we investigated the mulcting of Government after the fact. Now we propose to take preventive measures to eliminate those criminal elements which are preying upon the Government by using apparently legitimate labor unions as fronts, or work in collusion with dishonest management to

defraud the Government on its procurement and construction programs.

This investigation in this field, conducted properly and thoroughly, will prevent losses to our Government far exceeding the costs of such investigation.

I will have more to say on this subject at a later time.

At an early date I will also offer a separate resolution for the funds to continue the other functions of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred. The question of committee jurisdiction will be taken under consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 14), submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN, was ordered to lie on the table and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 14

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, in the course of investigations into Government procurement practices of the Defense Department, has found evidence of racketeering and collusion between certain labor officials and employers which might seriously affect and impair proper Government procurement; and

Whereas a preliminary staff investigation of such subcommittee with respect to the general field of improper activities of certain segments of labor union leadership and collusive practices of such leadership with management has disclosed conditions requiring a thorough investigation and exposure of the facts to determine whether further legislation should be recommended; and

Whereas the United States Government spends billions of dollars on procurement of goods and services every year, and hundreds of millions of dollars in the construction of public works; and

Whereas the United States Government is about to embark on a vast roadbuilding program which will involve the expenditure of many billions of dollars; and

Whereas the free flow of goods in interstate commerce is necessary for the efficient and economic administration of Government; and

Whereas the continuance of any such improper, illegal, and racketeering activities by certain union officials, in collusion with management or otherwise, may result in an enormous loss to the United States Government; and

Whereas evidence tending to show (1) the infiltration by criminal elements into the field of organized labor, (2) the use of violence, shakedowns, blackmail, bribery, embezzlement, extortion, by certain segments of union leadership, by collusion with management or otherwise, (3) the existence of other forms of corruption, violation, evasion of laws of the United States on the part of corrupt union officials, (4) that union funds are being misused and misappropriated for the personal benefit of certain union officials and true and accurate financial statements are, therefore, not being filed with the Labor Department as required by Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session, chapter 120, 9 (f) and (g), (5) the failure on the part of any agency of the Government to enforce existing laws and regulations; should be thoroughly investigated. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in the exercise of its jurisdiction under rule

XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to study the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency, to examine, investigate, and to study the impact of labor irregularities on Government operations, and to determine and make a complete study of—

(1) whether there exist any infiltration of persons engaged in pursuing criminal practices and activities in the field of organized labor or any other corrupt, collusive, or illegal practices such as racketeering, extortion, and blackmail, and improper practices which are against the public interest or against the interest of labor organizations or their membership;

(2) whether any such practices have occurred or resulted in violation of, or may occur or result in evasion or impairment of, any statutes of the United States, or violate the civil rights and liberties of individual members of organized labor or other persons;

(3) whether such statutes have been properly, efficiently, and vigorously enforced and administered by officers and agencies of the United States charged with responsibility for their enforcement and administration; and

(4) whether existing laws of the United States are adequate to protect the public interest and the interest of labor organizations and their membership against the occurrence of such practices.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, until January 31, 1958, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$250,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the committee.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United Nations emergency force should be made permanent.

We could thereby bring into being a truly international police force—something which for many years has been the dream of men seeking a world order based on law and justice.

The Charter of the United Nations itself provides for the establishment of such a force, but the Charter intended that this should be done under the aegis of the Security Council. Because of the cold war which has developed since the Charter was adopted in 1945, the Council, of course, has been unable to function as was contemplated.

Consequently, the functions of the General Assembly have greatly increased

in importance. It will be recalled that in 1950, during the Korean fighting, the Assembly adopted what is popularly known as the uniting for peace resolution. This resolution provided for action by the Assembly to meet world crises in which the Security Council was paralyzed by the veto. Among other things, the Assembly in that resolution recommended that each member of the U. N.—

maintain within its national armed forces elements so trained, organized and equipped that they could promptly be made available, in accordance with its constitutional processes, for service as a United Nations unit or units, upon recommendation by the Security Council or General Assembly, without prejudice to the use of such elements in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized in article 51 of the Charter.

It may also be recalled that generally similar objectives were sought in Senate Concurrent Resolution 50 of the 80th Congress, which I submitted in the Senate and which was sponsored by 16 Senators and in the House in the case of a similar resolution by a number of Representatives; also in Senate Resolution 133 of the 81st Congress which was submitted by 11 Senators, including myself.

The resolution which I submit today is not so detailed as these earlier resolutions. It contents itself, rather, with stating the broad principles involved. First, it welcomes the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force. Second, it expressed the sense of the Senate that this force should be made a permanent arm of the United Nations. Third, it endorses the principle that participation in this force should not be open to nationals or units of the armed forces of the great powers. This will insure that the force is composed of men from the smaller or medium-sized nations. Finally, the resolution says that the expenses of the force should be met by the United Nations out of its regular budget. This is in keeping with the concept of the force as a permanent arm of the U. N.

Within the broad framework of these general principles, Mr. President, there is ample room to work out details governing the operation and organization of the U. N. force.

Although the resolution which I submit today is not inconsistent with the U. N. uniting-for-peace resolution, it goes further than that resolution in one important respect and differs from it in another. The uniting-for-peace resolution contemplated that each member of the U. N. would maintain within its armed forces units which could be promptly made available to the U. N. My resolution would have the force maintained on a permanent basis by the U. N. itself. My resolution would also prevent participation in the force by the great powers—that is, the permanent members of the Security Council. This is in accordance with the regulations governing the U. N. emergency force now in operation in the Middle East. I do not see any objection, however, to the great powers contributing some equipment to the force; and, indeed, the United States has done so in the present instance.

It will no doubt be observed, Mr. President, that my resolution does not deal with the question of whether U. N. control of the force is to be exercised by the Security Council, the General Assembly, or both. It would seem to me personally that the pattern of the uniting-for-peace resolution might well be followed; that is, that the force would be under the Security Council initially, but that control could also be asserted by the Assembly when the Security Council is unable to act. This is a question, however, which I think can just as well be left for future determination by the U. N.

The important thing is to establish the force as a permanent fixture. Had it been in existence 2 years, or even 1 year, earlier, the tragic events of October and November in the Middle East might never have occurred.

Who can say that situations might not arise in other parts of the world calling for intervention by such an international force? I believe that the simple existence of this kind of force might well prevent the development of such situations.

Mr. President, the U. N. General Assembly has resumed its 11th session in New York. I hope that before it adjourns in February, the Assembly will itself take steps to constitute UNEF on a permanent basis. Favorable Senate action on a resolution such as I am introducing today would undoubtedly encourage the Assembly to take these steps.

I hope that this resolution may receive the early attention of the Foreign Relations Committee and of the Senate, that it will be sympathetically considered by the State Department and the President, and that the sentiments it expresses will be followed by our representatives at the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 15) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to lie on the desk until Friday next, as follows:

Whereas the United Nations Emergency Force, created pursuant to resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly of November 3 and 4, 1956 (A/RES/391 and A/RES/394), has made an important contribution to international peace and security in the Middle East; and

Whereas the need for such a force appears likely to continue; and

Whereas such a force could be an important instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security not only in the Middle East but also in other areas of the world: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate welcomes the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Senate that:

(a) The force should be made a permanent arm of the United Nations.

(b) The force should be composed of units made available by members of the United Nations: *Provided*, That no such units should be accepted from permanent members of the Security Council.

(c) Consideration should be given to arrangements whereby individuals would be allowed to volunteer for service with the force: *Provided*, That individuals who are nationals of permanent members of the Security Council should not be acceptable.

(d) Equipment and expenses of the force should be provided by the United Nations out of its regular budget.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution I am submitting today, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Permanent U. N. Police," published in the Washington Post of Sunday, January 6, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERMANENT U. N. POLICE

It is becoming increasingly apparent that some kind of international police force will be needed in the Near East for a long time. Unless the United Nations assumes a positive responsibility for preventing the renewal of clashes between Egypt and Israel pending a political settlement, the prospect of any stability will be dismal indeed.

What is required, in this newspaper's opinion, is United Nations occupation of a buffer zone along both sides of the Israeli-Egyptian border from the Gaza strip down to and including the coastline around the islands in the tip of the Gulf of Aqaba. This means a U. N. police force of sufficient size to patrol the border against raids. Ideally it also would mean United Nations purchase of the narrow border zone from both countries and administration of this zone as an international territory.

Obviously the United Nations ought not to be used to reward Israel for her attack. Israel will be unreasonable if she seeks aggrandizement or if she refuses to withdraw her troops in accordance with the U. N. request. She will not be unreasonable if she seeks guarantees against the sort of provocations that led to the attack. It would be wholly unrealistic for the U. N. to be concerned only with a return to the status quo before the invasion.

Indeed, such a narrow concern would surely invite contempt for the U. N. as an agency to maintain peace. It is necessary for the U. N. to consider causes as well as effects—to condemn the Israeli attack, but also to remember the constant Egyptian fedayeen raids that provoked it. The State Department is being pusillanimous in disregarding the substantial justice of Israel's appeal for guarantees. It requires no endorsement of Israeli tactics, which sometimes have seemed bloodthirsty, to understand that some kind of protection against renewed provocation is fundamental.

A buffer zone would not afford much protection, of course, unless there were some sort of military force to maintain it. Conceivably this would be possible with the United Nations Emergency Force now in existence. But most of the nations which have furnished troops for this undertaking regard it as a strictly temporary and limited assignment; some, indeed, have precluded the use of their troops in any effort to facilitate political settlement. In any event a U. N. police force made up of diverse national units would be subject to constant pulling and hauling.

Is it not time to take up the Canadian suggestion for a small permanent United Nations police force recruited as a unit? This could be on the order of a foreign legion under a commander responsible to the Secretary General and the General Assembly. Always before, proposals for a permanent international force have foundered because they have been considered too abstract. Here is a real situation that cries for this kind of policing. Following its request for broad authority to create an American shield over the Near East, the administration could use-

fully take some further initiative in strengthening the capability of the U. N. to keep peace within the area.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. JENNER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine and make a full and complete study and review of any and all matters pertaining to the administration of the Government Employees Life Insurance Program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF METHODS USED IN CALCULATING AMOUNTS PAID TO WHEAT PRODUCERS FOR PARTICIPATING IN ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the methods and formulas used by the Department of Agriculture in calculating the amount paid to producers of wheat for participating in the acreage reserve program, provided for in the Soil Bank Act, with a view to ascertaining what if any changes should be made in such act with respect to such methods and formulas.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized until June 1, 1957, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the

consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 1, 1957.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADOPTION OF RULES OF THE SENATE FOR THE 84TH CONGRESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Senate do now adopt as its rules for the 85th Congress the rules which prevailed during the 84th Congress except that rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking from subsection 2 the words "two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn" and inserting in lieu thereof "two-thirds of the Senators present and voting but in no case less than a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn."

AUTHORIZATION FOR ONE TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because my name was mentioned in the Douglas resolution, I wish to say that the resolution is not my first choice. I shall go along with it if there is no better choice. However, I have a better choice.

I resubmit a longstanding resolution providing for the imposition of cloture by a majority vote of the Senate of the United States, with a guaranty to the minority that 96 hours' time will be permitted, if the Senate so desires, so that each Senator will be allowed 1 hour to debate the issue, or farm out his time if he does not want to use it.

The resolution (S. Res. 21), submitted by Mr. MORSE, was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That subsection 2 of rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or VI or any other rule of

the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of."

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

SEC. 2. Subsection 3 of such rule is hereby repealed.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EXTENT OF FOREIGN INVESTMENTS IN CERTAIN CORPORATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a special committee to be composed of 5 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom 3 shall be members of the majority party and 2 shall be members of the minority party.

(b) The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of (1) the extent and nature of foreign investment in and control of corporations having defense contracts with the United States or having information the disclosure of which would be detrimental to the national defense, and (2) the extent to which the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and other applicable Federal statutes may be violated by persons in foreign countries in connection with the purchase or sale of securities of United States corporations, including persons controlling or seeking to acquire control of United States corporations, or acting for persons controlling or seeking to acquire control of such corporations.

SEC. 2. The committee shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the President of the Senate, select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members. Any vacancy

in the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to (1) hold such hearings; (2) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (3) require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and, with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it deems advisable.

(b) For the purpose of taking testimony the committee may provide that fewer than five but not less than two members shall constitute a quorum: *Provided*, That both the majority and minority parties are represented.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 5. (a) The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate not later than April 1, 1958.

(b) Upon the filing of its report, the committee shall cease to exist.

PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS OF THE SENATE

Mr. DWORSHAK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That, commencing with the 85th Congress, rule 25 of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section 1;

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) of section 1;

(3) inserting in section 1 after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

(4) striking out section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 19 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 7 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

PROHIBITION OF INTRODUCTION OF BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, OR AMENDMENTS BY TWO OR MORE SENATORS JOINTLY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution amending rule 14 of the standing rules of the Senate relating to the introduction of bills and other measures by two or more Senators jointly.

This proposal would amend paragraph 1 of rule 14 of the standing rules of the Senate to prohibit the multiple sponsorship of bills, joint resolutions, concurrent resolutions, simple resolutions, and amendments, except to permit cosponsorship only in cases of (a) legislation of a local nature or interest primarily to residents of a particular State, which may be introduced jointly by two Senators from that State; and (b) legislation authorizing two or more States to negotiate or enter into an interstate compact, which may be introduced jointly by the respective Senators from the States parties to the compact.

The prohibition of cosponsorship of legislation in the Senate would eliminate the current frequent practices of authors of legislative proposals who request that their measures "lie on the desk" so that the names of additional Senators can be added or who seek unanimous consent to add the names of other Senators to legislative proposals.

For a number of years it has been the firmly established precedent in the House of Representatives that two or more Members of that body cannot jointly introduce a bill or resolution, and that procedure is governed by the practice of the House rather than by any expressed rule.

I ask that the resolution, together with the accompanying papers, may be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 24) submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph No. 1 of rule 14 of the standing rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding after word "day", after the end of said paragraph, a semicolon and the following: "and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by 2 or more Senators, except that (1) the 2 Senators from any State may jointly introduce any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) 2 or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the State represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."; so that as amended the paragraph will read as follows:

"1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day; and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by 2 or more Senators, except that (1) the 2 Senators from any State may jointly introduce or propose any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) 2 or more Senators may joint-

ly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the State represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."

Report No. 2022

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 250) prohibiting the introduction of bills or joint resolutions by two or more Senators jointly, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, with an amendment (in the nature of a substitute), and an amendment to the title, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

Senate Resolution 250, as submitted and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, would prohibit the multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions in the Senate. To achieve that purpose it is proposed to amend paragraph 1 of rule 14 of the standing rules of the Senate by adding an additional clause to that paragraph. Paragraph 1 of rule 14 is here reproduced with the proposed amendment indicated by italic:

1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day; *and no bill or joint resolution shall be introduced jointly by or on behalf of two or more Senators.*

The author of the resolution, the late Senator Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky, gave the following explanation of his proposal at the time he submitted the resolution to the Senate:

(From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 4, p. 6941.)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have observed with some regret, as I am sure many other Senators have, the growing practice in the Senate of multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions. It is a practice which has developed in the past few years, and it seems to me to be a very bad one; indeed, in a sense, multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions seems to be assuming the aspects of a vicious practice.

During the entire history of the United States Senate, until very recently, it has been customary for a single Senator to introduce a bill or joint resolution. That is the practice which should have been followed, and, in my judgment, it is the one which should be observed now. The habit of introducing bills and having them lie on the table, in order that Senators may walk down the sawdust trail and attach their names to the bill, seems to me to be undignified in the highest sense of the word.

Furthermore, a Senator who works out a bill to canvass around among his colleagues to obtain signatures to his bill, in order that it may carry the prestige of many of the Senators and their names, frequently creates a situation in the Senate which is utterly indefensible.

If a Senator is able to peddle his bill around among other Senators, either by mail or in person, until he obtains a majority of the Senate, and they become committed to the bill by joint introduction, of what value is it to have committees? What function can a committee perform if a majority of the Senators have already committed themselves to a bill before its introduction?

It is embarrassing to Senators to deny to their colleagues sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions they contemplate introducing. I myself have adopted the uniform custom of not joining in the introduction of bills or joint resolutions, no matter how much I might favor them in principle. I have recently received letters from constituents ask-

ing why I did not join in a bill which had been jointly sponsored.

We have all seen Senators vote against bills which they had cosponsored. Very recently a very able, distinguished, and honorable Senator, one respected by all of us, cosponsored a measure. Then he was compelled not only to vote against it, but to speak against it in the Senate.

In the House of Representatives there is a rule against multiple sponsorship of bills, and only one Member may introduce a bill. That is a dignified practice. That is a proper way to proceed. Such a rule in the Senate would be the only way to keep Members of the Senate from being embarrassed by requests of colleagues to join in cosponsoring a bill. It seems to me it is the practice which should be followed, although there is no rule prohibiting multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions.

I believe every Senator present, in his heart, would like to see the rule amended, because we have all been embarrassed by importunities on the part of our colleagues. We all have received letters with a copy of a bill about to be introduced. We must either sign the bill, remain silent, or give some reason for not cosponsoring the bill. It is an undignified procedure.

NATURE OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

While the committee subscribes generally to the principle involved in Senate Resolution 250, it believes that joint sponsorship of legislation should continue to be permitted in certain instances. The committee also believes that the prohibition on joint sponsorship should not be restricted to bills and joint resolutions, but should apply as well to concurrent resolutions, simple resolutions, and amendments.

Senate Resolution 250 as reported with an amendment (in the nature of a substitute) incorporates the following changes from the text of the resolution as submitted:

1. The blanket prohibition against joint sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions has been modified to permit joint sponsorship only in the cases of—

(a) Legislation of a local nature or of interest primarily to residents of a particular State, which may be introduced jointly by the two Senators from that State; and

(b) Legislation authorizing two or more States to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact, which may be introduced jointly by the respective Senators from the States parties to the compact.

2. The prohibition on joint sponsorship has been made applicable to concurrent resolutions, simple resolutions, and amendments, as well as to bills and joint resolutions which alone were specified in the original text.

3. The prohibition on joint sponsorship or proposal of legislation in the Senate has been extended to encompass the current frequent practice indulged by authors of legislative proposals who ask that their measures "lie at the desk" so that the names of additional Senators can be added, or who seek unanimous consent to add the names of other Senators. The committee amendment provides that the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution or amendment is unauthorized.

The committee has also amended the title of Senate Resolution 250 so as to reflect the changes made in the text of the resolution.

JOINT SPONSORSHIP IS PROHIBITED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

In the House of Representatives two or more Members cannot jointly introduce a bill or resolution. This procedure of the House is governed by the practice of the House rather than by any express rule. The practice is firmly established, however, and proceedings in the House are governed just

as effectively by practice as by established written rule.

In the 2d session of the 60th Congress, a select committee was appointed to investigate and report to the House concerning the right of Members to present bills and resolutions with the names of more than one Member attached thereto. The select committee was under the chairmanship of Mr. John J. FitzGerald, of New York. He presented the unanimous report of the select committee to the House on March 3, 1909 (vol. 34, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 4, 60th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 3808-3811). The report of the select committee was adopted by the House and is now the precedent of the House. (See Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, 1936 edition, vol. VII, pp. 145-146.)

This report, in discussing rule 22 of the House of Representatives, which relates to the introduction of bills, resolutions, memorials and petitions, reads as follows:

"While the rule itself does not in express terms prohibit the attaching of the name of more than one Member to a bill or resolution when it is delivered to the Clerk or to the Speaker, as the case may be, for reference, attention is called to the second clause, requiring that under certain conditions the bill 'shall be returned to the Member from whom it was received.' The House however, in the conduct of its business is not controlled, nor is the business conducted, merely in accordance with the expressed Rules of the House. There are many situations not specifically covered by the written rules which are nevertheless regulated definitely by the procedure which has come down from time immemorial and which procedure is essential to the orderly conduct of the business of the House. * * * A casual examination of rule 22 does not disclose any inhibition against the attachment of more than a single name to a bill or resolution. Examined in the light of the evolution of the rules and practice relating to the presentation of bills, however, and bearing in mind the purpose sought to be accomplished by the changes made from time to time resulting finally in the introduction of all bills without the formality of recognition, it seems clear to the committee that the underlying principle of individual recognition still prevails and that the presentation of a bill involves such recognition. * * * the committee is unanimously of the opinion that under the true and proper construction of the rule the attaching of the name of more than one Member to a bill or resolution is unauthorized."

DISADVANTAGES OF COSPONSORSHIP

1. Cosponsorship interferes with the underlying principle of individual recognition and responsibility for legislation.

2. Cosponsorship of a particular bill by a large majority of Senators is an ineffective substitution for normal committee proceedings and constructive senatorial debate and deliberation. It leads to the elimination of committee hearings and does away with the occasion for Senate debate.

3. The availability of cosponsorship in the Senate has encouraged individual Senators to make a show of sentiment in support of a particular bill by entreating other Senators to join as cosponsors. In recent years this practice has run rampant. It has become a frequent occurrence nowadays for Senators introducing bills to ask that their bills "lie at the desk" so that the names of additional sponsors can be added. Also, individual Senators frequently rise nowadays and ask unanimous consent to have the names of certain other Senators added to a particular measure.

4. Through friendship, embarrassment, or fear of misinterpretation, it appears that some Senators consent to cosponsor bills

without sufficient study of their detailed provisions.

5. Individual Senators who (a) because of personal principle refrain from all cosponsorship, or (b) fail to cosponsor a particular measure because of lack of time to study its provisions or because of disagreement with some particular provision therein, may wrongfully be thought opposed to the objectives of popular legislation, when, in reality, they are in deep sympathy with those objectives.

That paragraph numbered 1 of rule 14 of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding after the word "day", after the end of said paragraph, a semicolon and the following: "and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by two or more Senators, except that (1) the two Senators from any State may jointly introduce or propose any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) two or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the States represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."; so that as amended the paragraph will read as follows:

"1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day; and no bill, resolution, or amendment may be introduced or proposed jointly by two or more Senators, except that (1) the two Senators from any State may jointly introduce or propose any private bill or resolution or any bill, resolution, or amendment of a local nature or of interest primarily to the residents of such State, and (2) two or more Senators may jointly introduce or propose any bill or joint resolution authorizing the States represented by them to negotiate or to enter into an interstate compact. Except as provided above, the affixing of the names of two or more Senators to a bill, resolution, or amendment is unauthorized."

PROHIBITION OF JOINT SPONSORSHIP OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may introduce a joint resolution and make a brief statement on it, without his losing the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have observed with some regret, as I am sure many other Senators have, the growing practice in the Senate of multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions. It is a practice which has developed in the past few years, and it seems to me to be a very bad one; indeed, in a sense, multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions seems to be assuming the aspects of a vicious practice.

During the entire history of the United States Senate, until very recently, it has been customary for a single Senator to introduce a bill or joint resolution. That is the practice which should have been followed, and, in my judgment, it is the one which should be observed now. The habit of introducing bills and having them lie on the table, in order that Senators may walk down the sawdust trail and attach their names to the bill, seems to me to be undignified in the highest sense of the word.

Furthermore, for a Senator who works out a bill to canvass around among his colleagues to obtain signatures to his bill, in order that it may carry the prestige of many of the Senators and their names, frequently creates a situation in the Senate which is utterly indefensible.

If a Senator is able to peddle his bill around among other Senators, either by mail or in person, until he obtains a majority of the Senate, and they become committed to the bill by joint introduction, of what value is it to have committees? What function can a committee perform, if a majority of the Senators have already committed themselves to a bill before its introduction?

It is embarrassing to Senators to deny to their colleagues sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions they contemplate introducing. I myself have adopted the uniform custom of not joining in the introduction of bills or joint resolutions, no matter how much I might favor them in principle. I have recently received letters from constituents asking why I did not join in a bill which had been jointly sponsored.

We have all seen Senators vote against bills which they had cosponsored. Very recently a very able, distinguished, and honorable Senator, one respected by all of us, cosponsored a measure. Then he was compelled not only to vote against it, but to speak against it in the Senate.

In the House of Representatives there is a rule against multiple sponsorship of bills, and only one Member may introduce a bill. That is a dignified practice. That is a proper way to proceed. Such a rule in the Senate would be the only way to keep Members of the Senate from being embarrassed by requests of colleagues to join in cosponsoring a bill. It seems to me it is the practice which should be followed, although there is no rule prohibiting multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit a resolution to amend the rule of the Senate so as to provide that only one Senator may introduce a bill or joint resolution, and that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I hope the Committee on Rules and Administration will give it earnest and prompt consideration, and hope I may be permitted, if necessary, to appear before the committee. [Applause.]

I believe every Senator present, in his heart, would like to see the rule amended, because we have all been embarrassed by importunities on the part of our colleagues. We all have received letters with a copy of a bill about to be introduced. We must either sign the bill, remain silent, or give some reason for not cosponsoring the bill. It is an undignified procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to receiving the resolution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object to receiving the resolution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 250) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 250), as follows:

"Resolved, That paragraph numbered 1 of rule 14 of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding after the word 'day,' after the end of said paragraph, a semicolon and the following: 'and no bill or joint resolution shall be introduced jointly by or on behalf of two or more Senators,' so that as amended the paragraph will read as follows:

"1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day; and no bill or joint resolution shall be introduced jointly by or on behalf of 2 or more Senators."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in believing that the resolution does not bear multiple sponsorship? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Illinois is correct in that assumption; and if he does not wish to take my word for it, he can go to the desk and examine the resolution. He will see that it has only one name on it.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I wish to state that action similar to that proposed by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Barkley] had been proposed in the committee and had been approved by the committee; and such a resolution is now in process of being drafted. I make that statement for the information of the Senate, and, in particular, for the information of the Senator who submitted the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Rhode Island to say that a similar resolution has already been approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. GREEN. No, Mr. President; I did not say that. I said such a resolution is under consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and is being drafted or redrafted, or a restatement of it is being drafted, by the staff of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the Federal employee group life insurance program by the Civil Service Commission;

(2) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(3) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) procedures, (b) public relations, (c) employee relations, (d) postmaster appointments, (e) research and development, and (f) postal rates.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the

Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1958.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ILLUSION OF REFORM ON THE PART OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNISTS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, it is extremely difficult for an untrained observer to keep up with the trend of events of a world character from day to day. The rapid changes of a fundamental nature in faraway trouble spots make it increasingly difficult for the people of our country to appraise properly the precise situation existing particularly in those areas behind the Iron Curtain.

After the meeting at the summit a year ago last summer, many people became convinced that at long last the leaders of the Kremlin had seen the light and that they were now ready to cooperate with the free world in an effort to find the road to peace. It was a high challenge, and reasonable men the world over searched their souls for a way to foster a growth of understanding between these two armed camps. When the true picture of Stalin was exposed to the eyes of the Russian people, many persons jumped to the conclusion that the Bolsheviks had really reformed. But when the red empire brought out its heavy artillery to crush the totally unarmed and defenseless people of Hungary, it was apparent to all that the Russian Communists had not deviated in the slightest from their historic policy to impose their atheistic and communistic system of philosophy on the whole world by subversion if possible and by force if necessary.

Mr. President, the word from Budapest this morning, that Russian tanks had rolled into that city to be on hand when Premier Kadar announced the imposition of "an old-style Communist dictatorship of the proletariat," made it clear that the last hope for political freedom in Hungary had been effectively crushed.

The danger to our country both at home and abroad from the onslaught of the Russian menace is plain and evident to every red-blooded American. President Eisenhower served notice in a dramatic fashion to the madmen of Moscow, and by now they know that they can go so far but no farther.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an editorial by my good friend and former associate, Lewis E. Bates, editor of the Wyoming State Tribune, under date of January 2 last, entitled "Those Reformed Reds." To my way of thinking, the editorial puts the Kremlin in a proper perspective. It is heartening to know that after all these years the minions of Red Russia have been unable to sell the youth of Hungary and perhaps of all the Iron Curtain countries the communistic bill of goods and, by the same token, surely not many people in our country will be taken in by the phony pleas and doctrines of communistic Russia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

THOSE REFORMED REDS

The daily flow of the news is a sufficient contradiction of the strange claim of many Americans that the Russians have reformed.

Hard on the heels of the utter brutality visited upon the defenseless people of Hungary—brutality continuing virtually every hour on the hour—comes additional evidence of Soviet viciousness on the other side of the world.

It is the report of Japanese repatriates from Russian labor camps in northern Siberia. They were the last to be returned under a recent Russian-Japanese treaty, and fell into Soviet hands in World War II.

It was captivity extended over 11 years, in itself pronounced inhumanity.

The repatriates said the 1,300,000 prisoners in Siberian camps were treated as vicious criminals, worked a minimum of 10 hours daily, and had to subsist on a diet of mostly powdered oats. No matter what work a prisoner had to do—most mined uranium, gold, chrome, manganese and other metals—the ration remained the same. Thousands, therefore, died of malnutrition.

Despite this, despite the news of Hungary, voices are still being heard in the land that the Russians have turned over a new leaf, that they are trying to be responsible members of world society.

These voices say the Reds have admitted Stalin was brutal and wrong; they point to the peace feelers put out before Geneva a year or so ago; they give emphasis to Russian disarmament proposals, particularly the outlawing of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

On the other hand, we remember the Reds promised, at Geneva, to release prisoners of war.

Russia has changed in no meaningful particular. Soviet atrocities have, in cold fact, grown worse under the successors of Stalin.

World opinion is reacting. The people of Iceland were about to exercise their option and ask us to leave, but after Budapest they took a second look. The people of Asia, who have been friendly inclined toward Moscow are now very disturbed.

It is all so plain. The free world still has to contend with a ruthless and vicious aggressor. There is no other way to look at it, not if we value our liberties.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on the first of the year there retired from this body a Member who, in my opinion, was one of our great Americans.

On January 1 the New York Times published an editorial entitled "Mr. Lehman Retires."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the *RECORD* at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

MR. LEHMAN RETIRES

As Herbert H. Lehman was approaching the end of his third term as Governor of the State of New York a political observer wrote from Albany that "one gets the impression that this is his last year in public life and that he is saying to the public: 'This has been my work and I think I have done it well.'"

That was in 1938, when Governor Lehman had already established a permanent place for himself in the history of this State as a distinguished chief executive as well as a noted

philanthropist and businessman. In the 18 years since then the people of the State of New York and of all of the United States can be thankful that Herbert H. Lehman did not retire from public life when he was a mere 60 years old. Now at last, at the age of 78, he really is retiring—or, as he himself puts it, relinquishing public office—not retiring from public affairs.

We hope that he will have many more years in which the State and the Nation can benefit from his advice and experience, and above all from his unswerving integrity of purpose. Mr. Lehman's is one of the voices in the Senate that could always be counted upon to speak up for justice, for decency and for dignity in the conduct of national and international affairs, in the relations of our Government to the defenseless as well as to the most powerful. There are few men in public life today of whom it could be said more feelingly on the eve of their retirement: "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it had been my intention to ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD the beautiful and merited editorial tribute to former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, which appeared on the editorial page of the New York Times of January 1, 1957. Inasmuch, however, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has requested the printing in the RECORD of this excellent editorial, which honors the distinguished and illustrious public service of Herbert Lehman over a period of more than three decades, I shall not duplicate the request.

PARITY PRICES REST ON QUICKSAND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the agricultural issues that requires the consideration of this Congress is the method used by the Department of Agriculture to determine price support levels for dairy products.

The November issue of Hoard's Dairyman, one of the outstanding publications serving the interests of dairy farmers, contained an enlightening and informative article explaining this parity formula situation. Written by H. Willis Tobler, director of legislation for the National Milk Producers Federation, the article should clear up much of the confusion and misunderstanding that exists regarding this issue and emphasize the need for corrective legislation. I commend Hoard's editors for a real service to the dairy industry in publishing this analysis of what is happening to dairy price supports under administrative juggling, and to congratulate Mr. Tobler on his excellent presentation.

Because I intend to seek the corrective action need at a later date, I desire to call attention of my colleagues to this article as a valuable reference document.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARITY PRICES REST ON QUICKSAND (By H. Willis Tobler)

Through March 31, manufacturing milk, testing 3.95 percent, is supported at \$3.25

per hundredweight. Butterfat is supported at 58.6 cents per pound.

Dairymen will recall that the Secretary of Agriculture established this support level following the President's veto message on the general farm bill, April 16, 1956. Previously, the Secretary had announced, February 14, supports of \$3.15 for manufacturing milk and 56.2 cents for fat. The same prices had prevailed the previous year.

What percentage of parity is provided by the increased support price? There are two answers: 80 percent and 85 percent.

Which is correct? Both are, depending upon the formula used by the Department of Agriculture.

Which formula should be used? The answer requires a review of the legislative history of dairy price supports.

When Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1948, it stated with respect to milk and its products: "To support until January 1, 1950, a price to producers of commodities * * * of not less than 60 percent of the parity or comparable price therefore, nor more than the level at which such commodity was supported in 1948, except that * * * milk and its products * * * shall be supported at 90 percent of parity or comparable price."

To carry out the law, United States Department of Agriculture developed plans in late 1948 for a purchase program. Butter, cheese, and other dairy products would be acquired at prices which would result in farmers receiving the announced support price level for milk and butterfat.

In 1948, and today, United States Department of Agriculture computes only the parity price of all milk (fluid and manufacturing) sold wholesale by farmers. There is no parity price for milk used in manufacturing dairy products.

The Department held, and rightly so, that a support purchase program should involve only manufacturing milk and not all milk sold wholesale. In the absence of a parity price for manufacturing milk, therefore, a substitute yardstick was necessary. After consulting with dairy leaders and others interested, a formula was devised, and put into operation by administrative action, which would provide a "parity equivalent" price for manufacturing milk.

To apply the formula two factors were needed:

1. The parity price of all milk sold wholesale.
2. The ratio between the average price for all milk sold wholesale and the average price paid for manufacturing milk.

The only free market period available was July 1946 through December 1948. During these 30 months, price controls were not in effect and there were no price support inventories. During this time the average price paid for manufacturing milk was 88.5 percent of the average price for all milk sold wholesale. Somewhat later a statistical correction was made which resulted in a ratio of 88.

Now, let's see how the parity formula works. It looks like this: parity price of all milk sold wholesale \times ratio = parity equivalent price \times percentage of parity price support level = support price.

When United States Department of Agriculture started to purchase dairy products, in February 1949, the parity price of all milk sold wholesale was \$3.92. The law provided 90 percent nor less than 75 percent of formula applied:

$$\$3.92 \times 88.5 = \$3.47 \times 90\% = \$3.12$$

The next year Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1949. This stated: "The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at such level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 75 percent of the

parity price therefore as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply. Such price support shall be provided through loans on, or purchases of, the products of milk and butterfat.

From 1949 and into the marketing year beginning April 1, 1954, United States Department of Agriculture calculated price supports, as shown in table A.

Note that during this period the parity equivalent ratio of 88.5 was used to determine the support price on manufacturing milk.

Early in 1954 two important changes took place insofar as dairy farmers are concerned. The Secretary of Agriculture announced, February 15, that price supports would be reduced to 75 percent of parity. This would apply in the marketing year beginning April 1 and continue through March 31, 1955.

In figuring a support price of \$3.14 (subsequently adjusted to \$3.15) note that the Department, in establishing a \$3.14 price, used the old ratio of 88.5 as it had for the previous 5 years. This point has an important bearing on the controversy which has developed over which formula should be used.

Two months later the Department abandoned the 88.5 ratio and by administrative action picked up instead a "modernized" parity equivalent price.

This new method provided that the ratio would be computed annually. It would use the base period July 1946 through December each year until a period of 10 years had elapsed. Thereafter the base period would always be the most recent 10 years. In other words, the ratio would be set on a 10-year moving average.

During April, then, the ratio dropped from 88.5 to 84.1. This was due to the inclusion of the average prices received by farmers for the years 1949 through 1953. Table B indicates the base period which will be used for the marketing years through March 31, 1960:

These two actions, in early 1954, sparked a dairy controversy which has raged ever since. Recall that the announcement was made February 15 that supports would be at 75 percent of parity, or \$3.14, beginning April 1. The Department used the ratio of 88.5. The next month, in March, the Department again stated that the support level would be 75 percent of parity. However, in the next month, April, after the new marketing year started, the Department announced the ratio of 84.1 instead of 88.5 would reflect the parity equivalent price. The \$3.14 floor was retained, however.

Significant here, then, is that the new ratio meant that the Government was supporting prices at 78.6 percent of parity instead of 75 percent. And here is where the confusion and juggling began. Ever since, farmers have been getting a higher and higher percentage of parity for manufacturing milk * * * but no more money, until the President's veto message.

To justify the new procedure, the Department referred to an announcement it made early in 1949. At that time it was stated that the method of calculating the parity equivalent price would be subject to revision as additional data became available.

Dairy leaders countered by pointing out that such data became available in January 1950. Why, then, did the Department wait until April 1954 to use it?

Perhaps table C may give some clue to the answer:

Note that for 3 years the support price was announced as \$3.15. With an enlarging base period, however, the ratio was decreased each marketing year. With each decrease in the ratio, the \$3.15 meant a higher parity level. What had been 75 percent of parity was now 82.4 percent of parity but the price was still the same.

The Department, of course, had some precedent for using the new 10-year moving average. It could point to a similar process developed for modernized parity on so-called basic agricultural commodities.

Dairy leaders claim that such a comparison is not valid. They point out that, since January 1950, the parity price of all milk sold wholesale by farmers has been computed under modernized parity or a 10-year moving average. They emphasize that dairy farmers already are subjected to the modernized parity concept. The Department's action, therefore, has the effect of modernizing an already modernized formula.

So much for the past and present. What really concerns us is the future. Let's look at table D (which assumes that price indices remain unchanged):

Note that we assume a support price of \$3.15 through March 31, 1964. Because of the changing ratio, that support price which was 75 percent of parity 2 years ago has become over 90 percent of parity.

Let's look now at what can happen by establishing the support price at the legal minimum level of 75 percent under the changing ratio. See table E.

During the next 4 significant years the support price can drop from the present \$3.25 to \$2.74 or a total of 51 cents per hundredweight.

Why hasn't something been done about this? Actually, a very determined fight was put up by dairy leaders during the recent session of Congress. Both Republicans and Democrats from dairy States vigorously supported setting the ratio at a firm 88.

Initial success was achieved when the Senate Agriculture Committee provided in the original farm bill for mandatory use of the base period reflecting the 88 ratio. The entire Senate subsequently approved it.

Since the House of Representatives and the Senate passed conflicting farm bills, they had to iron out their differences in conference. In that conference the ratio was dumped.

When the compromise bill came to the floor of the House an effort was made to reject the conference report and send it back to committee with certain instructions. Through the action of some Representatives from dairy districts, one of those important specifications was the use of the 88 ratio. The motion failed to carry, however, and the conference report was adopted. As a result, the original farm bill which President Eisenhower vetoed, contained no protection for dairy farmers against the changing ratio.

At present, the \$3.25 price support level is maintained solely by presidential directive. There is no assurance whatsoever that it will be maintained beyond next March 31. Of course, the price could be increased by administrative action even for the balance of the current marketing year.

However, unless Congress acts early next year, price supports for manufacturing milk can drop to an estimated \$2.83 beginning April 1. The Secretary of Agriculture can, as in 1954, make a finding that a 75 percent support level will assure an adequate supply which is specifically referred to in the Agricultural Act of 1949. Also, he can continue to use the changing ratio.

The issue which you should discuss in your organizations, and with your Senators and Representatives, is whether or not you want to continue on with the changing ratio formula, or return to the stabilized procedure. Your income for the years ahead and its relation to parity will depend largely on the course which is approved by Congress during the first 3 months of next year.

TABLE A.—How price supports were calculated until Apr. 1, 1954

Marketing year	Parity price of all milk sold wholesale	Ratio	Parity equivalent price	Price-support level	Support price
				Percent	
Feb. 1, 1949 to Dec. 31, 1949	\$3.92	88.5	\$3.47	90	\$3.12
Jan. 1, 1950 to Mar. 31, 1951	4.40	88.5	3.89	79	3.07
Apr. 1, 1951 to Mar. 31, 1952	4.69	88.5	4.15	87	3.60
Apr. 1, 1952 to Mar. 31, 1953	4.84	88.5	4.28	90	3.85
Apr. 1, 1953 to Mar. 31, 1954	4.70	88.5	4.16	90	3.74
Apr. 1, 1954 to Mar. 31, 1955	4.74	88.5	4.19	75	3.14

¹ No official record. Reflects estimated revision made in January 1950.

² Adjusted to \$3.15 on July 7, 1954.

TABLE B.—New base periods through 1960

Marketing year	Base period
Apr. 1, 1954 to Mar. 31, 1955	July 1946 to December 1953.
Apr. 1, 1955 to Mar. 31, 1956	July 1946 to December 1954.
Apr. 1, 1956 to Mar. 31, 1957	July 1946 to December 1955.
Apr. 1, 1957 to Mar. 31, 1958	January 1947 to December 1956.
Apr. 1, 1958 to Mar. 31, 1959	January 1948 to December 1957.
Apr. 1, 1959 to Mar. 31, 1960	January 1949 to December 1958.

TABLE C.—Higher parity but same price

Marketing year	Parity price of all milk	Ratio	Parity equivalent price	Support price	Support price as percentage of parity equivalent
Apr. 1, 1954 to Mar. 31, 1955	\$4.74	84.1	\$3.99	¹ \$3.15	78.9
Apr. 1, 1955 to Mar. 31, 1956	4.70	83.7	3.93	3.15	80.2
Apr. 1, 1956 to Mar. 31, 1957	4.59	83.3	3.82	² 3.15	82.4

¹ Adjusted from \$3.14 on July 7, 1954.

² Adjusted to \$3.25 on Apr. 18, 1956, in accordance with farm veto message.

TABLE D.—How 75 percent becomes 90 percent of parity

Marketing year	Parity price of all milk	Ratio	Parity equivalent price	Support price	Support price as a percentage of parity equivalent price
Apr. 1, 1957 to Mar. 31, 1958	\$4.60	82.0	\$3.77	\$3.15	83.5
Apr. 1, 1958 to Mar. 31, 1959	4.63	80.8	3.74	3.15	84
Apr. 1, 1959 to Mar. 31, 1960	4.63	79.3	3.67	3.15	85.8
Apr. 1, 1960 to Mar. 31, 1961	4.65	78.5	3.65	3.15	86.3
Apr. 1, 1961 to Mar. 31, 1962	4.70	77.2	3.63	3.15	86.7
Apr. 1, 1962 to Mar. 31, 1963	4.76	75.1	3.57	3.15	88
Apr. 1, 1963 to Mar. 31, 1964	4.75	73.0	3.47	3.15	90.7

TABLE E.—Support price can drop 51 cents

Marketing year	Parity price of all milk	Ratio	Parity equivalent price	Price support level	Support price
				Percent	
Apr. 1, 1957 to Mar. 31, 1958	\$4.60	82.0	\$3.77	75	\$2.83
Apr. 1, 1958 to Mar. 31, 1959	4.63	80.8	3.74	75	2.81
Apr. 1, 1959 to Mar. 31, 1960	4.63	79.3	3.67	75	2.75
Apr. 1, 1960 to Mar. 31, 1961	4.65	78.5	3.65	75	2.74

OUR POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Saturday President Eisenhower addressed a joint session of Congress and asked for new commitments in connection with our policy in the Middle East.

Recently I have been privileged to attend the 11th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations as one of the American delegates in the company of the distinguished minority leader of the Senate [Mr. KNOWLAND]. During these weeks it has become clearer to me than ever before that there is no single area in the world that provides more complicated and difficult problems for American policy than the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that a speech which I delivered at the Overseas Press Club, in New York, on December 20, 1956, an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune, of December 26, 1956, and a newsletter which I have just released dealing with the Middle East situation be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech, editorial, and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY BEFORE OVERSEAS PRESS CLUB, NEW YORK, DECEMBER 20, 1956

We are almost at the end of the most momentous year since World War II. It has

been a paradoxical year, one in which both the United States and the Soviet Union have suffered severe diplomatic defeats. The United States saw the North Atlantic Alliance shaken to its roots when war broke out in the Middle East. And the Soviet Union lost its grip on the captive countries of Eastern Europe.

It is too soon to attempt to strike a balance as to who lost more. It is not too soon, however—indeed, we have waited too long already—to begin an urgent reappraisal, however agonizing it may be, of the world situation and of our own posture toward it.

Quite obviously, fundamental changes of enormous consequence have taken place. No man can foresee where they will end. The old, static condition has ended; conditions are more fluid than at any time since 1945. The cold war has changed from one of fixed positions to one of maneuver. This increases somewhat the dangers; but it also greatly increases the opportunities for statesmanship that is both wise and bold, imaginative and judicious.

Our first task is to assess the nature and implications of these changes that are taking place.

The first thing we must realize is that in today's world there can be no effective foreign policy without risks. There is no risk-proof insurance policy that will guarantee freedom and security in today's world.

One of the basic facts of our time is the spirit of nationalism which dominates the thinking of most of the underdeveloped areas of the world. We are all familiar with the manifestations of this force, the antiwesternism throughout much of Asia and Africa and the irresponsible fashion in which the Soviet Union has tried to take advantage of this feeling and use it for its own ends. What we are now seeing is the reemergence of this same spirit of nationalism in the Soviet captive countries of Eastern Europe.

Nationalism is challenging international communism on its home grounds, and the end is not yet. This points up, as clearly as anything possibly could, the truth of what many Americans have been saying for years, namely, that international communism is fundamentally inconsistent with nationalism and that it presents the most serious threat of all to the hard-won independence of the new states of Asia and Africa.

The rise of nationalism throughout so much of the world presents a paradox in that it comes at the time when most of the more highly developed countries, such as the United States and the nations of Western Europe, are moving more and more toward forms of international organization which play down nationalism. It is both useless and wrong to try to oppose nationalism—useless because any such opposition would be foredoomed to failure; wrong because nationalism springs from basically good, patriotic feelings which are shared to some degree by all men everywhere. Of course, self-determination of national groups has been a keystone of American policy since the days of Woodrow Wilson, so all this is nothing new to us.

One reason we need the U. N. is to provide a constructive focus for this tremendous force of nationalism which otherwise would be running wild. The U. N. does not control nationalism, but it does provide a framework in which nationalism can find its proper and responsible place in a world society that is becoming increasingly interdependent. The U. N. can likewise protect and encourage nationalism.

The problems we now face in Eastern Europe and the Middle East have little in common, but it can be said, I think, that the roots of the problems in both instances are nationalist in origin. The challenge, both before the U. N. and before our own

Government, is how we deal with these problems in a responsible manner calculated to promote the principles of the United Nations Charter, to advance the national interests of the United States, and to bring some greater measure of peace and freedom to the people of the areas concerned.

Before I come to some specific steps which I think we could well take to deal with this new world situation, let me emphasize two very important points which are often overlooked in discussions of American foreign policy and the United Nations. One is that our ability to control events beyond our own borders is sharply limited. There is available neither in the State Department nor Congress nor the United Nations a magic wand by which we can bring into being, at will, situations abroad precisely to our liking.

The other point is that the U. N. itself is only what its members make of it. It is a vehicle for its members, a mechanism for expressing their combined judgments. As a result of Soviet abuse of the veto, the Security Council has come to be considerably less important, and the General Assembly has come to be considerably more important, than the founders of the U. N. envisaged. The Assembly obviously cannot be controlled by any one power, but many members of the Assembly do look for leadership to states who are more vitally interested in specific questions. This makes it all the more important that the United States, as one of the members which must supply the leadership, have a clear, well-conceived policy.

I applaud the recently repeated statements by the President that some of these problems, such as those in Eastern Europe and the Middle East, must be dealt with by the U. N. But if that is to be our attitude, then it urgently behooves us to have some clear idea of what we think the U. N. ought to do. The U. N. does not act automatically; it is not a kind of international Univac into which you can feed a problem and get an answer. So far, I regret to say, the United States has had only general objectives; it has not had clearly defined policies in regard to achieving those objectives.

There is a tendency among some people to pooch-pooch the United Nations as a debating society which can do no more than adopt pious resolutions. What these people overlook, however, is that these resolutions express the collective conscience of mankind. Even the mighty Soviet Union is not wholly insulated from the force of world public opinion. It has taken a considerable beating because of its actions in Hungary. Increasingly, in United Nations votes on the Hungarian question more and more so-called neutralists have shifted from a position of abstention to a position of voting against the Soviets. Soviet fakery, doubledealing, and doublecrossing has been clearly exposed. Not for a long time, if ever, can the Soviets count on the same kind of openminded reception in many of the Asian-African states that they were receiving a year ago. The more we can keep the truth about the U. S. S. R. before the people of the world the better off we will be.

The ferment in Eastern Europe obviously presents opportunities, but it also places a great obligation on us to act in a sober, responsible manner.

We should be prepared to discuss sympathetically economic aid with the independent governments of Eastern Europe, as, for example, Poland. But there is no occasion for us to rush forward with a massive aid program; among other things, such action on our part would probably tend to push the Poles, and others like them who might come along, back more completely under the Soviet thumb. In this connection—and it applies to our problems in other parts of the world as well—there is altogether too great

a tendency in the State Department to think of some form of assistance as the answer to every problem. This is what my late colleague, Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, once called the checkbook reflex—whenever a new world crisis occurs, there is a sort of reflex action in the State Department to reach for Uncle Sam's checkbook. Now, the checkbook is a very useful thing, and I have supported our aid programs generally, but too many people have the fallacious notion that aid is good for what ails you, and that if you have aid you don't need anything else.

Much can be done through other policies if we but have the wit to think of them. And we had better think of some, pretty fast, because the manifestations of nationalism in Eastern Europe increase the urgency of finding some sort of security system that Europe can live with. In some respects, the obvious weaknesses of communism in the captive countries may well give the Soviets pause. But in other respects this situation could trigger world war III—either as a Soviet tactic to reestablish control or as a consequence of some as yet more violent explosion in one of the satellites.

Germany is the crux of this matter. A revolt in East Germany in any way comparable to that which occurred in Hungary would have even more serious repercussions. It behooves us, therefore, constantly to seek new ways and means of achieving our objective of a reunified Germany. It might be worthwhile, for example, to consider a European security arrangement of which an important part might be an agreement whereby we would pull our troops out of West Germany if the Russians would pull their troops out of East Germany. If we could thereby achieve a free, united Germany, which would remain in NATO, I think we would have made a good bargain. Let me make emphatically clear that I am not proposing an American withdrawal from all of Western Europe, but only from Germany and only on condition of Soviet withdrawal from Germany and a free, united Germany as a NATO partner.

One of the important effects of such an agreement would be that the frontiers of freedom would be pushed right up to the Polish border. The Poles would inevitably feel, and benefit from, such a development. Their isolation would be reduced. Their contacts with the West would be increased. And the net result would be, I believe, more strain upon their ties with Moscow.

Now, this deal has so many dangers for the Soviets that they might very well reject it out of hand. But the Soviets are having their troubles in East Germany. And in any event, the more they refuse to agree to reasonable proposals, the more difficult their international position becomes.

We should continue, of course, to use every avenue available to put increasing pressure on the Soviets through the United Nations in regard to the Hungarian situation. By their arrogant defiance of the U. N., they are increasingly isolating themselves from the rest of humanity.

The U. N. actions in regard to Hungary have not been as vigorous as I would have liked and the situation has dragged on longer than I would have liked, but by proceeding one step at a time we have been able to resolve some of the doubts that troubled many of the Asian-African states at the beginning.

It is my personal view, however, that the U. N. should go further in regard to Hungary. In commenting upon the U. N. action in regard to the Middle East, Vice President Nixon recently said that it upheld the rule of law—"the same law for the powerful and the strong as for the weak and the defenseless." What the U. N. must now do in regard to Hungary is to apply the same

law to the scoundrels and aggressors as to the decent and honorable.

At the same time, we might as well recognize that, if the Soviets are determined to stay in Hungary, we can get them out only by force—and this would extend the danger of the use of force beyond Hungary. But we should certainly make it as expensive and uncomfortable for them as we possibly can. Certainly the U. N. cannot content itself with condemnatory resolutions, no matter how strongly worded. We should not only take steps to insure against the return of the spurious Hungarian representatives who walked out of the U. N. last week; we should also give consideration to economic and diplomatic sanctions against the Kadar regime in Hungary and against the Soviet Union itself.

As of now, the Soviet Union and her puppet regime in Budapest have refused to let U. N. observers come into Hungary. We must continue to press hard to demand that these observers be admitted.

Even without observers, the world has learned several things from these recent horrors in Hungary.

1. These uprisings show that there still exists in satellite lands the same love of freedom which is the natural heritage of man everywhere.

2. We have learned how totally unrealistic it is to assume that the people of the satellite countries will automatically support Moscow. That is a very important lesson.

3. We have learned that you cannot easily crush the spirit of liberty. It keeps glowing in spite of years of totalitarian repression and in spite of foreign armies.

4. We have learned that even the youth brought up during such periods of repression still desire liberty and are willing to fight for it.

There are still other lessons that the United States, in particular, has learned from the Hungarian affair. We have learned that our Immigration Act and provisions for the reception of refugees need overhauling—badly and urgently. Such basic overhauling should be one of the first jobs of the next Congress.

We have also learned that food is tremendously important as a weapon—both in a cold war and in a hot war, and this has been something of a hot war.

Our policy with regard to food assistance has not been clear. It is disgraceful that we should receive dispatches about food shortages, even in Austria, when we have adequate supplies, including supplies of milk, that we could easily have sent. We should dramatize the airlift, which we're using to bring in refugees, by sending every plane back on the return trip loaded to capacity with powdered milk and other food supplies, so that our response could be immediately seen and our aid would be dramatic, and inspiring to those who are fighting for freedom.

We should also extend the use of American food to any country that takes refugees and needs such aid, besides Austria.

Finally, we must not treat these Hungarians who have come here just as another lot of refugees. We should be placing the technically trained and skilled people at once, and advertising to the world that we have welcomed them as a permanent part of our free American economy. This is no time to sit around, feeling that we have done our good deeds, once we have brought out a few of these people to our side of the ocean, and housed them in barracks here. That is only a start, which will do little good in this present situation unless we follow it up with other deeds.

Revelation of the Soviet oppression in Hungary has had the most damaging effect on the Communist Party of anything since the Stalin-Hitler pact of 1939. It has increased the chances of the breakdown of the

Soviet empire and has contributed to the unrest of students and intellectuals in Russia itself. Now is the time when America should speak not only in terms of good will, but in terms of definite actions—actions which may involve risks, but as I said before, there is no riskproof insurance policy covering such things as freedom and security.

Turning now to the Middle East, we find an area where the problems are so many and so complex that one hardly knows where to start. It is now truly a power vacuum. Although Soviet influence has greatly increased, American prestige is also at a new high. As the Soviet threat makes solutions to the area's problems more urgent, so does the new American position, coupled with the new solidarity which has developed in the U. N., offer hope of finding solutions.

The U. N. has an especially important role to play. It is dangerous for either the United States or the Soviet Union to try to be the dominant power in the Middle East; this is an area ready-made for the kind of international ministrations that the U. N. is peculiarly equipped to undertake.

As Germany is the key in Europe, so I think the Arab-Israeli conflict is the key in the Middle East. It is idle to expect peace ever to come to that unhappy area until some settlement of this conflict is reached.

It has been amply demonstrated that the U. N. will not tolerate aggression in the Middle East. It is also, I think, becoming increasingly clear to the states of that area that it is not in their own interests to rely on the Soviet Union. What we must now do is to make it still more clear to the Arabs and Israelis alike that it is in their own interests to reach a settlement, that they hurt themselves more than anyone else by stubbornly insisting that the world has not moved since 1947. In the last analysis, this dispute can be settled only by the parties concerned, and we cannot expect them to do that until they realize that they will be better off with it settled than with it unsettled.

The United States and also the United Nations must be firm and just with both sides. As we acted to halt the invasion of Egypt, so we should now take steps to halt persecutions of Jews in Egypt. We can certainly not stand idly by in the face of increasing reports of anti-Semitism as an official policy of the Nasser government.

In the best of circumstances, it will take at least a generation—probably 2 or 3—for the hatreds of the Middle East to entirely abate. The more each side retaliates against the other, the longer it will take.

It is unrealistic to expect an Arab-Israeli settlement to spring full-blown from any single set of negotiations. A settlement in the Middle East must be pursued one step at a time.

The first step is obviously to bring about a complete withdrawal of foreign forces from the area, in prompt compliance with U. N. resolutions.

The second step is a settlement of the Suez Canal problem over and above the physical work of clearance. Here the six principles unanimously agreed to by the U. N. Security Council offer a good starting point for reaching an agreement on the canal's operation.

With these immediate issues out of the way and with a groundwork of quiet, careful, diplomatic preparation, we can approach negotiations for a general settlement. There are other things, however, that we can also be doing in the meantime. What the Middle East desperately needs is economic development—not simply for its own sake but as a constructive endeavor to occupy the minds and energies of the people and their leaders. We have furnished a considerable amount of economic and technical assistance to the area; yet, with a few exceptions, it has not been particularly effective. We have tried very hard, and have failed, to get agreements

on regional projects, such as the Jordan River plan.

The time may now be more propitious for such undertakings, and we should vigorously renew our efforts, not only to get the Jordan River and similar projects under way but also to get some action on the refugee problem.

It might be useful, in this connection, to consider establishing, under United Nations auspices, a Middle East Development Authority. Most of the economic as well as the other problems of the area are international in their scope. Most of them also require outside assistance, either in the form of capital, of technical aid, or of good offices. Why not, then, have an international agency to deal with them? The kind of Middle East Development Authority that I have in mind would have, on its Board of Directors, representatives of all the states of the area as well as representatives of the states furnishing capital and technical assistance. Ample provision could be made to protect national sovereignties.

In any event, it appears obvious that we are going to have to extend more aid to the Middle East—and do it more effectively.

Perhaps the most unfortunate aspect of the whole Suez affair is that innocent bystanders, both in Europe and in the Middle East, are getting hurt. All of Western Europe is suffering from oil shortages along with Britain and France, though none of the other countries in Western Europe can be charged with any responsibility for their present troubles. And in the Middle East, the oil-producing states are suffering from lack of markets, though two of those states—Iraq and Iran—had nothing to do with the events which brought this situation about.

And the poor old American taxpayer is left to pick up the check. I don't think there is anything else for him to do, however, in his own interests. After too long a delay, we properly began steps to relieve the Western European oil shortage. We had to do so; otherwise, the West European economy would be wrecked and we would lose our \$13 billion investment in the Marshall plan. I think we should also take a look very soon at the economic effects of the Suez crisis in the Middle East.

To sum up:

In the Middle East we must insist that the canal be opened and cleared. We must insist upon the use of British and French and any other available equipment in helping achieve a purpose that is vital to all of us. We must keep U. N. forces in the Middle East large enough to cope with any danger in the area, and as long as is necessary, until a permanent settlement has been worked out. That settlement must be one which opens the Suez Canal and guarantees that it will remain open, free, and unfettered, for the safe conduct of the shipping of all the world, including Israeli ships. The question of national ownership is secondary—but the effectiveness and enforceability of these guarantees must be absolute.

In the end, an Arab-Israeli settlement must be brought about in Palestine. While the Arabs refuse to recognize the existence of Israel such a settlement is impossible. We must use every device available to American diplomacy, operating through the United Nations and otherwise, to overcome this intransigence, to make it clear that we expect to see a settlement reached, and that we insist upon an ending of the interminable border raids from either direction. Meanwhile, we must move forward with a bold regional plan for economic aid, such as I have already outlined.

Political factors must not be allowed to prevent settlement of the refugee problem. Wherever these refugees came from—and there are Jewish refugees from Arab countries as well as Arab refugees from Palestine—they are all of them people, and our

first concern must be to get these human beings settled and reintegrated as part of the permanent economy of an area in the world that is easily able to support them, given some sensible economic plan and reasonable assistance.

Now to conclude, the year 1957, which is almost upon us, is likely to be even more crucial than 1956. We have got to be both steadfast in principle and flexible in tactics. Today I have had time only to scratch the surface of some of the problems we face. I have raised more questions than I have answered.

I think we can find the answers, but it will take more imagination and courage, fewer platitudes and less blinking at facts, than we have shown heretofore.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of December 26, 1956]

MORAL FORCE NOT ENOUGH

There appears to be growing concern in many quarters that United States foreign policy is being administered more often by Dag Hammarskjöld than by John Foster Dulles. This is another way of saying that the United States seems to be putting more reliance on the moral force of the United Nations and less on its own military might.

In Western Europe, this new trend in American foreign policy is being viewed with some alarm. It has led to expressions of concern about whether the United States is planning to withdraw or reduce its forces in Western Europe. This idea was planted by the Soviet Union when it suggested that it might reduce or withdraw its forces in the satellites as a quid pro quo for an American withdrawal or reduction of its forces in Germany.

In Asia, however, the new American foreign policy emphasis is being widely hailed by the neutral nations. They heartily approve of the United States action in calling upon Israel, Britain, and France to withdraw their forces from Egypt. They now tend to regard the United States as a new champion of the rights of the one-time colonies that have emerged into statehood of their own.

During the Middle Eastern crisis it is true that the United States has voted in the United Nations against its NATO allies, Britain and France. And it is true that we have relied upon the U. N. General Assembly and its token police force and its moral suasion to restore peace to that area of the world.

Yet the new emphasis on the United Nations by the United States does not mean that we can disarm or dissolve our military alliances or even withdraw from Western Europe until we are certain that the threat of Communist domination of the world is ended. And nobody is making that claim after what happened to Hungary.

President Eisenhower did appear to rule out the use of force in the Middle East in his pre-election speech October 31, but we suspect that American military might still is ready for use in that area of the world if the Soviet Union tries to start something. In spite of our reliance upon the U. N., history has shown time and again that force is the one sure deterrent to aggression.

Until the U. N. possesses that force—and perhaps the tiny international army in the Middle East is a start—it is senseless to talk about substituting U. N. policy for American foreign policy. Those who continue to do so are not serving the best interests of the United States.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(Newsletter from the desk of Senator
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Concern over the Middle East overshadowed everything else during opening week of the 85th Congress. The President's request for congressional sanction to the use of force

if necessary has been met with mixed reactions from Democrats and Republicans alike. On the one hand, Congress certainly would not repudiate the power and responsibility the President already has as Commander in Chief. It is not conceivable that our country, in our own interests, could ignore Soviet military aggression against any other country in the vital Middle East. On the other hand, there is widespread regret that the President felt it necessary to seek formal action of the Congress which in effect means little more than reaffirming authority he already has. It was apparently felt necessary only because the President and his Secretary of State had previously declared just the opposite—that there would be no involvement of American forces in the Middle East.

NOT MUCH NEW

The consensus here has been that there is really little new in the President's foreign-policy proposal. What he is saying is that he is Commander in Chief. What he is saying is that the Constitution does place upon him the responsibility for protecting American interests. What he is saying, in effect, is that he never should have said what he did in the first place—that the United States would not assert its own power unilaterally in the Middle East. It was that declaration, virtually removing ourselves as a powerful force in that area, which created a vacuum that had to be filled by reasserting our intention of forcefully opposing aggression. Actually, we already have treaty obligations to some of these states in the Middle East. So in substance what the President was doing was to say that we will fulfill our commitments to Greece and Turkey under NATO and to Pakistan under SEATO—something that should have been assumed all along.

POLICY WEAKNESS

Much of the concern in Congress is centered on the fact that the Eisenhower proposal is directed solely against the Soviet Union in terms of Soviet military aggression. There is not a very clear-cut view of what it would do, or what effect it could have, in terms of offsetting Soviet political penetration or infiltration, such as Soviet arms sales to Syria and Egypt, or Soviet conspiracy in the area with native leaders and native forces, or what it could do for example to restrain Syria or Egypt if they wanted to attack someplace in the area and expand their own area of influence backed up by Soviet money, Soviet technicians, and Soviet arms.

CONGRESS' ATTITUDE

While asking searching questions and seeking more explicit clarification, Congress certainly will uphold the President in an effort to redeem our good name. It will concur in an effort to recapture the strength we had and almost tossed overboard. It will probably be accepted with modifications to reassert a truth we all accept—that we will oppose Soviet military aggression wherever it occurs, and whatever it requires of us. Unfortunately, it comes late. And, unfortunately, it is an official announcement of our willingness to use force right after we have made too many official announcements some weeks ago that we would not use force. Is it any wonder that our friends are confused, and that our enemies are doubtful as to our purposes?

COOPERATIVES AND TAXATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many of us who are friends of the great cooperative movement have been deeply disturbed lately to see advertisements in large national magazines designed to convey a completely false picture of cooperatives and taxation. A recent ad-

vertisement by some of our electric light and power companies appeared in *Look* magazine and is a special case in point.

The general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, has written me exposing this particular bit of fraudulent advertising. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ellis' letter to me be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D. C., December 31, 1956.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

United States Senate,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Enclosed for your information and study is a copy of an advertisement appearing in *Look* magazine on November 13, 1956. It may have appeared in several other publications simultaneously, as has been the custom with such ads.

This advertisement is not sales advertising. It is not goodwill advertising. It is propaganda advertising, designed to convey a completely false picture, and for lobbying purposes. There can be little doubt that it is carefully designed to poison the minds of the American people and their public officials against rural electric cooperatives and public agencies such as municipalities, public power districts, and the Federal power program.

The advertisement is part of a lobbying program that has been carried on through national magazines, daily newspapers, radio, TV, and other media for several years, with the tempo greatly increased over the past few years. The cost of this propaganda campaign unquestionably runs into many millions of dollars a year.

The total cost of this program of misrepresentation and political pressure is paid by those who must of necessity buy electricity from the companies who sponsor these ads, for they are monopolies within their respective areas. In addition, since the costs of such ads and other manipulations of the public mind are deductible expenses for tax purposes, 52 percent of the cost of this propaganda comes out of the Federal Treasury. We do not believe that it was the intent of Congress for consumers and taxpayers to pay the cost of their own misinformation.

The attached ad alleges that there is a privileged class of people in this country who pay little or no taxes in their electric bills. This privileged class, according to the ad, is made up of those people who secure their electricity from Government wholesale power sources.

The rural electric cooperatives purchased during the year ending June 30, 1956, only 6 percent of all federally generated power, whereas private power companies secured 10 percent and private industry 20 percent. Obviously, the implications with respect to taxes are false.

We could go on criticizing this particular ad and others, but we are sure you will recognize these and the other misleading and the categorically false statements contained in this and similar ads.

It seems to us that the time has long passed when the Congress should take legislative notice of the use of tax-free funds for propaganda purposes by so-called regulated monopolies and enact statutes to place the cost of these programs on those who really sponsor them. For, under the law of the land as interpreted by the highest courts, in handling funds collected for the privileged conduct of a public service, they are in the same position as agents of the State engaged in a public business.

In this connection, the full House Committee on Government Operations, 84th Congress, has at least recognized the problem. In House Report No. 2279, the committee made this recommendation:

"(6) Congress launch a full-scale joint investigation by both Houses to determine whether or not there is an organized effort of the private power companies to influence the Federal administration, the Congress, the governments of the States, and the political life of the Nation."

Many of these ads have in the past branded as socialistic programs of the Federal Government, such as Rural Electrification Administration, TVA, Bonneville, Southwestern Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, etc. In so doing the authors of these ads are apparently endeavoring to cast serious doubts on the intelligence and judgment of the Members of the Congress in passing legislation which they regard as vital to the welfare of the Nation.

We recognize the right of free speech, including the right of the capital stockowners of privately owned electric companies to use such propaganda advertisements to place their views on current issues before the public, provided the owners do it at their own expense. But, we are convinced that remedial legislation is today necessary to close the door to the use of ratepayers' money collected to pay the cost of a public service for their own private purposes.

We further question whether as a matter of policy a democracy can afford to permit privately owned public service monopolies—monopolies licensed to provide the public with a basic service and authorized by the Legislature and public courts to engage in public service business—to engage in unlimited propaganda activities.

And if and to whatever extent such propaganda spending is tolerated, the cost of it, we insist, should be borne by the owner-stockholders and not by the ratepayers.

The farmers' rural electric systems of the country have a direct interest in these propaganda expenditures for two reasons:

1. Nearly two-thirds of the rural electrics are purchasing their wholesale power requirements from the privately owned public utilities, for which they paid them \$59,449,112 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and

2. Nearly one-third of the rural electrics are purchasing all or part of their wholesale power requirements from the Federal wholesale power agencies under laws being attacked by these ads, and for which the rural electrics paid the Government \$26,844,795 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR WALTER EVANS EDGE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I announce to my colleagues with deep regret, the death on October 29 last of Walter Evans Edge, a former Senator in the Congress of the United States from New Jersey.

The career of Walter Edge is the story of a gifted man who unceasingly served his State and his Nation with the many skills at his command. Legislator, governor, businessman, newspaper publisher, diplomat, banker, and author, he liberally gave of his manifold talents; and his death was a personal shock not only to those of us who cherished his friendship, but a deep loss to his State, his country, and his party, where his valued experience and sage counsel was

sought and always granted with unstinting courtesy and generosity.

Walter Edge was majority leader of the State Assembly of New Jersey in 1910; he was president of the Senate of New Jersey in 1915; he was twice elected Governor of New Jersey, first during World War I and then subsequently during World War II; he was a member of the United States Senate from 1918 to 1929, where he served on the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committees on Finance, and Banking and Currency; he was Ambassador to France by appointment of President Hoover from 1929 to 1933; and he was the personal representative of President Eisenhower at the coronation of King Faisal II of Iraq in 1953. His brilliant career covered half a century of significant public life.

His vibrant personality, depth of character, personal loyalty, and discerning judgment, and his readiness to recognize the desirability of and to strive for changes, were manifest traits of his outstanding leadership ability.

To his tasks as a public servant he brought his rich and bountiful business experience and acumen, and his career was devoted to working toward "a government attuned to the needs of an industrialized state." His record both in New Jersey and in this body comprises a living memorial in such diverse fields as workmen's compensation and social legislation, highway construction, international trade, fiscal and administrative reform, interstate cooperation, constitutional revision, and housing and veterans' legislation.

His association with the first successful workmen's compensation legislation in the United States, with the building of the Holland Tunnel, the Philadelphia and Camden Bridge, the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, revision of the century-old New Jersey constitution in 1947, and the intricate negotiations between the United States and France over debt moratorium in 1932, strikingly exemplify the successful adaptation of his businessman's approach to public service: "The public official today must have an appreciation of cold, hard facts, and a courage to face them."

Close friend of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, and early sponsor of President Eisenhower, his participation as an elder statesman in the Republican Party was crowned last August by his attendance as delegate at his 13th national convention, a record probably unsurpassed by anyone in our Nation's history.

Walter Edge was a firm advocate of the deeply ingrained American philosophy that every person should utilize his natural gifts to the utmost. To him the first "law of manliness" was to be completely on your own, and while there might be a limit to your grasp, there could be no limit to your goal. "The constant devotion of his talents in following this precept to the enrichment of his own life and of the lives of those whom he served is mirrored in our awareness today of the loss which his State and his Nation have suffered by his death."

Walter Edge was a self-made man, and although his Quaker parents died while

he was still a young boy, by the time he was 18 he had obtained control of an advertising agency in Atlantic City, N. J., which he later built into an international business. His launching of a newspaper at the age of 20 in the same city was so successful that in 2 years he was able to buy out the leading newspaper in Atlantic County. By the time he was 25 this son of a railroad worker was well on his way to becoming a wealthy man.

It was shortly afterward, in 1897, that he made his first entry into politics as the journal clerk of the New Jersey Senate. From there his brilliant rise in public service continued through the remainder of his life.

To his State and to his country is left the record of a man who exemplified the finest which this Nation can produce. His deep-lying principles offer sure guidance to those who will succeed him in public service. His message is the message of America.

In his autobiography in 1948, Governor Edge modestly wrote:

These notes are not important in themselves and perhaps the historian will find little in them to footnote his previous studies, but if the record lends assurance to a few aspiring young men and women that America is still free to those who will use their freedom, and that no form of public security can permanently replace the God-given right of every citizen to achieve the fullest expression of his life, the purpose of this volume will have been fulfilled.

His many achievements in helping to further the growth and the glory of his State and his country during his years as a public servant constitute the most enduring tribute to these imperishable principles of this generous and gifted American.

I desire to close these remarks with a warm personal appreciation of a close friendship of many years. Walter Edge could play as well as work. He was an ardent fisherman, and regularly went salmon fishing to his favorite Canadian river, the Ristigouche; he enjoyed each year the bird shooting on his southern plantation in Georgia. Walter Edge loved people, and people loved him.

My wife joins me in this tribute to Walter Edge, and we record our affectionate sympathies for his wife and family in their great loss.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to join with my able colleague from New Jersey in his tribute to Walter Edge, who was one of the outstanding figures of our State. Few men have served their country over such a long span of years as did former Senator Edge.

Through the years his warm and generous spirit brightened the lives of everyone with whom he came into contact.

Mrs. Case and I join in expressing our deep sympathy to the members of his family; and I wish to pay a personal tribute to the man whose influence on my life has been very great.

DEATH OF T. MILLET HAND, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution

coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 15) as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the death of the Honorable T. MILLET HAND, a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is with great sorrow that I announce the death of the Honorable T. MILLET HAND, a Representative in the Congress from the Second District of New Jersey.

In submitting the appropriate resolution, I wish to say that Representative HAND was one of my closest friends, and I had known him for many years. He was one of the most outstanding legislators we have had in Congress for the past 10 or 12 years.

In his memory, I send a resolution to the desk, which I ask unanimous consent to have immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 8) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. T. MILLET HAND, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague in sponsoring the resolution which was just agreed to.

DEATH OF CARL HINSHAW, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 14) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the death of Hon. CARL HINSHAW, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I submit a resolution relative to the death of the Honorable CARL HINSHAW, a Representative from the State of California. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 9) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CARL HINSHAW, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Wednesday next.

DEATH OF J. PERCY PRIEST, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 16), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the death of Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GORE] and myself, I submit a resolution with respect to the untimely death of Representative J. PERCY PRIEST, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 10) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

DEATH OF HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 17), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the death of Hon. ANTONIO F. FERNANDEZ, a Representative from the State of New Mexico.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution with reference to the death of the Honorable ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ. I should like to

have the RECORD show that the resolution is submitted by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], for himself and myself.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 11) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, late a Representative from the State of New Mexico.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES—JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order of January 5, I suggest that the Senate now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for a joint session of the two Houses for the purpose of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

Under the order of Saturday last, at the conclusion of the joint session the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock meridian on Wednesday next.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m., the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

(For the proceedings in the House of Representatives in connection with the counting of the electoral votes, see today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Pursuant to the order entered on Saturday, January 5, 1957, at the conclusion of the joint session the Senate stood in recess until Wednesday, January 9, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian, the recess being taken, in accordance with resolutions adopted today as a further mark of respect to the memory of deceased Members of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offering the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, as we now unite our hearts in prayer, wilt Thou

answer our loftiest aspirations with Thy divine inspirations.

We rejoice that Thou art always drawing us to Thyself, seeking to give us Thy blessed companionship and to guide us by Thy unerring counsel.

Grant that daily we may be sensitive and responsive to the promptings and persuasions of Thy holy spirit and may there be in us a new nativity of the cardinal virtues of faith, hope, and love.

May our life be rich in the love that seeketh not its own and the courage that remains strong and steadfast in times of trial and tribulation.

Show us how we may be partners with Thee and with one another in the great redemptive ministry of leading bruised and brokenhearted humanity out of the darkness of hatred and fear into the glorious light of the kingdom of brotherhood and good will.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 5, 1957, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carroll, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the Congress on Thursday, January 10, 1957, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to extend the time for transmitting the economic report of the President for the first regular session of the 85th Congress.

The message also announced that in compliance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, 85th Congress, 1st session, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], are appointed tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are Members present who desire to take the oath of office. If they will present themselves, they will be sworn in.

Messrs. PASSMAN and UDALL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ELECTION OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 81) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members

of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: John Taber, New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walt Horan, Washington; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Benjamin F. James, Pennsylvania; Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Michigan; Edward T. Miller, Maryland; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Harold C. Ostertag, New York; Frank T. Bow, Ohio.

Committee on Armed Services: Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; W. Sterling Cole, New York; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Walter Norblad, Oregon; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; William H. Bates, Massachusetts; William E. Hess, Ohio; James P. S. Devereux, Maryland; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; William G. Bray, Indiana; Robert C. Wilson, California; Frank C. Osmer, Jr., New Jersey.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Robert B. Chipfield, Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Donald L. Jackson, California; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Edmund P. Radwan, New York; Albert P. Morano, Connecticut; Marguerite Stitt Church, Illinois; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; Winston L. Prouty, Vermont; Alvin M. Bentley, Michigan.

Committee on Rules: Leo E. Allen, Illinois; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Henry J. Latham, New York.

Committee on Ways and Means: Daniel A. Reed, New York; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Hal Holmes, Washington; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Antonio N. Sadlak, Connecticut; Howard H. Baker, Tennessee; Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTES—JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

At 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. William M. Miller, an-

nounced the Vice President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, headed by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice President took his seat as the presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The joint session was called to order by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States, have met in joint session for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice President. Under well-established precedent, unless a motion shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been made that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes cast by the electors of the several States.

The tellers, Mr. GREEN and Mr. JENNER on the part of the Senate, and Mr. BURLISON and Mr. Lecompte on the part of the House, took their places at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hands to the tellers the certificates of the electors for President and Vice President of the State of Alabama, and they will count and make a list of the votes cast by that State.

Senator GREEN (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, received 10 votes for President, and Walter B. Jones, of the State of Alabama, received 1 vote for President. Estes Kefauver, of the State of Tennessee, received 10 votes for Vice President, and Herman E. Talmadge, of the State of Georgia, received 1 vote for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Chair will omit in further procedure the formal statement just made and will open in alphabetical order and pass to the tellers the certificates showing the votes of the electors of each State. The tellers will read, count, and announce the result in each State as was done in the State of Alabama.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in alphabetical order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the Congress, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the Vice President.

The tellers delivered to the Vice President the following statement of the results:

The undersigned, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and WILLIAM E. JENNER, tellers on the part of the Senate, and OMAR BURLISON and KARL M. Lecompte, tellers on the part of the House

of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and count-

ing of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the

term beginning on the 20th day of January 1957:

States	Electoral votes of each State	For President			For Vice President			States	Electoral votes of each State	For President			For Vice President		
		Dwight D. Eisenhower, of Pennsylvania	Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois	Walter B. Jones, of Alabama	Richard M. Nixon, of California	Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee	Herman Talmadge, of Georgia			Dwight D. Eisenhower, of Pennsylvania	Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois	Walter B. Jones, of Alabama	Richard M. Nixon, of California	Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee	Herman Talmadge, of Georgia
Alabama	11		10	1		10	1	Nevada	3	3			3		
Arizona	4	4			4			New Hampshire	4	4			4		
Arkansas	8		8			8		New Jersey	16	16			16		
California	32	32			32			New Mexico	4	4			4		
Colorado	6	6			6			New York	45	45			45		
Connecticut	8	8			8			North Carolina	14		14			14	
Delaware	3	3			3			North Dakota	4	4			4		
Florida	10	10			10			Ohio	25	25			25		
Georgia	12		12			12		Oklahoma	8	8			8		
Idaho	4				4			Oregon	6	6			6		
Illinois	27	27			27			Pennsylvania	32	32			32		
Indiana	13	13			13			Rhode Island	4	4			4		
Iowa	10	10			10			South Carolina	8		8			8	
Kansas	8	8			8			South Dakota	4	4			4		
Kentucky	10	10			10			Tennessee	11	11			11		
Louisiana	10	10			10			Texas	24	24			24		
Maine	5	5			5			Utah	4	4			4		
Maryland	9	9			9			Vermont	3	3			3		
Massachusetts	16	16			16			Virginia	12	12			12		
Michigan	20	20			20			Washington	9	9			9		
Minnesota	11	11			11			West Virginia	8	8			8		
Mississippi	8		8			8		Wisconsin	12	12			12		
Missouri	13		13			13		Wyoming	3	3			3		
Montana	4	4						Total	531	457	73	1	457	73	1
Nebraska	6	6				6									

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Tellers on the part of the Senate.
OMAR BURLESON,
KARL M. LECOMPTÉ,
Tellers on the part of
the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, of the State of Pennsylvania, has received for President of the United States 457 votes;

Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, has received 73 votes;

Walter B. Jones, of the State of Alabama, has received 1 vote.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Richard M. Nixon, of the State of California, has received for Vice President of the United States 457 votes;

Estes Kefauver, of the State of Tennessee, has received 73 votes;

Herman Talmadge, of the State of Georgia, has received 1 vote.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1957, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen, the purpose for which the joint session of the two Houses of Congress has been called pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, having been accomplished, the Chair declares the joint session dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses of Congress was dissolved.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair di-

rects that the electoral vote be spread at large upon the Journal.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution for immediate consideration. The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 82

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs: BARRATT O'HARA, Illinois; L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina; DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida; FRANK M. COFFIN, Maine; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADMINISTERING THE OATH OF OFFICE TO REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT JAMES B. BOWLER

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your designation of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] pursuant to House Resolution 10, 85th Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect JAMES B. BOWLER of the Seventh District of Illinois, I have the honor to report that on Friday, January 4, 1957, at Chicago, Ill., Mr. BOYLE administered the oath of office to Mr. BOWLER, form prescribed by section 1757 of the revised statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. BOWLER subscribed.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 83

Whereas JAMES B. BOWLER, a Representative from the State of Illinois, from the Seventh District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to

and subscribed to the oath of office before the Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said JAMES B. BOWLER as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM FOR THE MERRIMACK RIVER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my very deep appreciation for the fact that my colleague from Lawrence, a neighboring city to Lowell, on the Merrimack River spoke yesterday of the tremendous need we have up there for flood control. He referred to our great danger from floods in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I would request the help of all the Members to get the State of New Hampshire to agree to a compact which is necessary if we are to build a dam in New Hampshire. Massachusetts has agreed to and signed its part of the compact. New Hampshire must do its part. Otherwise the people in the Merrimack Valley of New Hampshire, as well as our people in the State of Massachusetts, will suffer horribly if there is another devastating flood, which is likely to occur at any time. There was very grave danger last spring when minute by minute the flooded river was watched. We in the Merrimack Valley are sitting on a volcano. The people in New Hampshire in the Merrimack Valley are of course in great danger also.

CATHOLICS HIT VISIT BY TITO

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 5, 1957, the Detroit Times carried an article entitled "Catholics Hit Visit by Tito," reprinted in part from the Michigan Catholic, one of the largest archdiocesan papers in the country. I would like to register, along with these distinguished papers, my strongest opposition to extending the hand of friendship to this ruthless dictator whose avowed purpose in life is advancement of atheistic international communism. Does the administration realize the deep psychological damage that could be done around the world by the reception at the White House of this enemy of freedom and human dignity? I hope a roar of protest from every corner of this land will make it abundantly clear to our officials that the American people do not want anything to do with the "Butcher of Belgrade."

CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the year 1956 the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, held extensive hearings on the subject of civil defense in our Nation. At the conclusion of those hearings we brought forth a report. During the interim we had the staff prepare a legislative draft of a bill which I have introduced today.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the draft of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point and a brief analysis of the contents of the bill be printed thereafter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Civil Defense Reorganization Act."

Table of Contents

Sec. 2. Declaration of policy.

TITLE I—CREATION AND ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT

- Sec. 101. Department of Civil Defense.
- Sec. 102. Secretary of Civil Defense.
- Sec. 103. Other principal officers of the Department.
- Sec. 104. Compensation of principal officers.
- Sec. 105. Delegation of authority.
- Sec. 106. Seal.
- Sec. 107. Provisions of law applicable to Department.
- Sec. 108. Military Liaison Committee.
- Sec. 109. Scientific Advisory Board.
- Sec. 110. Civil Defense Advisory Council.

TITLE II—DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

- Sec. 201. National plan of civil defense.
 - Sec. 202. Execution of national plan.
- TITLE III—TRANSFERS OF FUNCTIONS
- Sec. 301. Transfer of Federal civil disaster functions.
 - Sec. 302. Transfer of Office of Defense Mobilization civil defense functions.
 - Sec. 303. Transfer of records, personnel, etc.
 - Sec. 304. References to transferred functions.
 - Sec. 305. Effect of existing official actions.
 - Sec. 306. Abolition of Federal Civil Defense Administration.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 401. Employment of personnel.
- Sec. 402. Employment of temporary personnel.
- Sec. 403. Establishment of advisory boards.
- Sec. 404. Procurement of property.
- Sec. 405. Disposal of property.
- Sec. 406. Utilization of Federal agencies.
- Sec. 407. Utilization of other services.
- Sec. 408. Acceptance of supplies, etc.
- Sec. 409. Purchase of printing work.
- Sec. 410. Identity insignia.
- Sec. 411. Exemption from certain provisions.
- Sec. 412. Security regulations.
- Sec. 413. Appropriations and transfers of funds.
- Sec. 414. Annual report to the Congress.
- Sec. 415. Definitions.
- Sec. 416. Separability.

TITLE V—EMERGENCY AUTHORITY

- Sec. 501. Declaration of policy.
- Sec. 502. National civil defense emergency.
- Sec. 503. Emergency powers.
- Sec. 504. Additional emergency powers.
- Sec. 505. Reports on emergency actions.
- Sec. 506. Immunity from suit.
- Sec. 507. Waiver of Administrative Procedure Act.
- Sec. 508. Compensation for nongovernmental property acquired.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that civil defense is an integral part of national defense and a direct responsibility of the Federal Government in keeping with its constitutional duties to provide for the common defense and to protect the States against invasion. The purpose of this act is to reorganize and redefine the civil defense functions of the Federal Government to enable the Government to more effectively perform these functions and thereby to protect the people of the United States from attack and to help maintain the security and integrity of the Nation. In affirming the Federal responsibility for civil defense, the Congress recognizes that the States and their political subdivisions have an important supporting role and should be assisted and encouraged to perform appropriate civil defense tasks consistent with the national plan of civil defense provided for in this act. In declaring civil defense to be an integral part of the national defense, the Congress recognizes that civil defense is essentially a nonmilitary function because of its major dependence upon civilian agencies and resources and its intimate bearing upon the normal peacetime pursuits of Government, industry, community and civic bodies, and individual citizens.

TITLE I—CREATION AND ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT

Department of Civil Defense

SEC. 101. There is hereby established an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Civil Defense (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"), at the head of which shall be a Secretary of Civil Defense.

Secretary of Civil Defense

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Civil Defense (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall be appointed by the President,

by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The Secretary shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to civil defense, and shall, under the direction of the President and subject to the provisions of this act, have direction, authority, and control over the Department.

(c) The Secretary shall serve as a member of the National Security Council.

Other principal officers of the Department

SEC. 103. (a) There shall be in the Department a Deputy Secretary of Civil Defense, an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Civil Defense, three Assistant Secretaries of Civil Defense, and a General Counsel, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The Deputy Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary shall prescribe and shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Secretary during his absence or disability or during a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

(c) The Administrative Assistant Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries, and the General Counsel shall perform such functions as the Secretary shall prescribe; and one of them (determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Secretary during the absence or disability of both the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary or during a vacancy in the offices of Secretary and Deputy Secretary.

Compensation of principal officers

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary shall receive the compensation prescribed by law for heads of executive departments.

(b) The Deputy Secretary of Civil Defense shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,500 per annum.

(c) The Administrative Assistant Secretary of Civil Defense, the Assistant Secretaries of Civil Defense, and the General Counsel shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$20,000 per annum.

Delegation of authority

SEC. 105. The Secretary may, without being relieved of general responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provision of law, make such provision as he may deem appropriate authorizing the performance of any function vested in him (except the function of being a member of the National Security Council) by or through such officers, agencies divisions, or other organizational entities of the Department as he may designate.

Seal

SEC. 106. The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

Provisions of law applicable to department

SEC. 107. Except to the extent inconsistent with this act, all provisions of law applicable to the executive departments generally shall apply to the Department.

Military Liaison Committee

SEC. 108. There is hereby created a Military Liaison Committee (hereinafter called the "Committee") consisting of a Chairman, who shall be the head thereof, and of a representative or representatives of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, detailed or assigned thereto, without additional compensation, in such numbers as the Secretary of Defense may determine. Representatives from each of the three departments shall be designated by the respective Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of the Department.

The Secretary shall advise and consult with the Committee on all Department of Defense matters which relate to civil defense, including scientific and technological developments in nuclear, biological, and chemical warfare, nuclear weapon effects, shelter and other protective measures planned or utilized by the Armed Forces to minimize such effects, passive defense plans or systems for military installations, radiological monitoring and bomb reconnaissance and disposal techniques, civil defense training and exercises of military personnel, availability of military personnel, facilities, supplies, and equipment for potential or actual use in civil defense, and such other matters as the Secretary or the Committee deems to be of interest and benefit to the Department. The Secretary and the Committee shall keep each other fully informed on all of the activities of their respective departments relating to civil defense matters. The Committee shall have authority to make written recommendations to the Secretary on matters relating to Department of Defense activities from time to time as it may deem appropriate.

Scientific Advisory Board

SEC. 109. There is hereby created a Scientific Advisory Board (hereinafter called the "Board") to advise the Secretary on scientific and technical matters related to civil defense. The Board shall make periodic evaluations of current civil defense research projects and programs and shall make recommendations for undertaking new projects and programs. The Board shall be composed of 12 members of outstanding scientific ability appointed from civilian life by the President. Each member shall hold office for a term of 6 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 4 at the end of 2 years, 4 at the end of 4 years, and 4 at the end of 6 years. The Board shall designate 1 of its members as Chairman. The Board shall meet at least twice in each year. Each member of the Board shall receive compensation of not to exceed \$50 per diem, plus transportation expenses and not to exceed \$20 per diem in lieu of subsistence, while engaged in the work of the Board.

Civil Defense Advisory Council

SEC. 110. There is hereby created a Civil Defense Advisory Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall advise and consult with the Secretary on general policies which relate to civil defense, including civilian and industrial participation in civil-defense activities, State and local government relationships with Federal civil defense authorities, and educational and information programs for instructing the public in civil-defense activities. The Council shall consist of the Secretary, who shall be Chairman, and 15 additional members to be appointed by the President, with the following representation: 3 representing State government, 3 representing political subdivisions of the States, 3 representing industry, 3 representing labor, and 3 to be selected from among the citizens of the United States of broad and varied experience in matters affecting the public interest (other than employees of any department or agency of the United States who, as such, regularly receive compensation for current services). Each member shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this

act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 5 members (1 from each representative group) at the end of 2 years, 5 (1 from each representative group) at the end of 3 years, 5 members (1 from each representative group) at the end of 4 years, after the date of enactment of this act. The Council shall meet at least four times in each year and at such other times as the Secretary shall determine. Each member of the Council shall receive his transportation expenses and not to exceed \$20 per diem in lieu of subsistence while engaged in the work of the Council.

TITLE II—DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

National plan of civil defense

SEC. 201. The Secretary shall, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and with the appropriate State and local officials, prepare and execute a national plan of civil defense for the United States which, in the event of anticipated or actual enemy attack, will effectively provide for—

- (1) clear and prompt warning to the civilian population;
- (2) public information as to the immediate measures which must be taken to minimize the effects of enemy action;
- (3) shelter of the civilian population against the primary and secondary effects of nuclear explosions;
- (4) control of traffic, lighting, and civil communications;
- (5) enforcement of civil-defense regulations;
- (6) evacuation of persons from target areas when evacuation is feasible;
- (7) food and clothing and medical, health, sanitation, welfare, and other services for sheltered, displaced, and evacuated persons;
- (8) monitoring for radiological, biological, and chemical hazards;
- (9) decontamination of areas, facilities, and supplies subjected to such hazards;
- (10) unexploded bomb reconnaissance and disposition;
- (11) fire fighting, rescue, debris clearance, and other emergency services;
- (12) movement of essential personnel to places of employment;
- (13) repair or restoration of essential industrial, communications, transportation, utility, and other facilities; and
- (14) resumption and continuity of essential industrial production, economic activities, and governmental functions and services.

Execution of national plan

SEC. 202. In order to accomplish the foregoing and in furtherance of the national plan of civil defense, the Secretary shall, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the appropriate State and local officials—

- (1) define the potential target areas of the United States and determine their relative importance, taking into account population density, production role, and other factors;
- (2) institute systematic measures to reduce the vulnerability of such target areas to enemy attack;
- (3) construct group shelters in each target area and make appropriate arrangements for their maintenance in a condition of readiness, including their use for commercial or civic purposes consistent with civil defense requirements;
- (4) establish and maintain warning and communications systems or devices and control centers;
- (5) procure, stockpile, and store in strategic locations necessary medical supplies and equipment, foodstuffs, industrial, transportation, communications, utility and other materials, supplies, and equipment;
- (6) establish and operate technical schools and training centers and provide expert instruction and training in civil defense or-

ganization, operations, and techniques to Federal, State, and local civil defense personnel;

(7) provide timely, periodic, and authoritative information to State and local civil defense officials and to the public concerning civil defense measures and requirements;

(8) establish civil defense research laboratories and conduct research directly or by contract for civil defense purposes;

(9) provide advisory services to industry concerning plant location and protection, participation in civil defense training and exercises, and other civil defense activities;

(10) continuously review Federal programs for their civil defense aspects, and make recommendations to the President and the Congress concerning administrative or legislative changes to conform such programs to civil defense requirements;

(11) direct, with the approval of the President, other Federal departments and agencies to undertake specific civil defense projects or programs, and evaluate performance in such undertakings;

(12) establish such regional, area, or local offices and civil defense organizational arrangements as will facilitate the execution of the Secretary's duties and functions;

(13) integrate civil defense measures with those for the protection of military, atomic, and other defense installations;

(14) assist State and local civil defense organizations by contributing funds for personnel and administrative expenses and for purchase of equipment, supplies, training devices, and other civil defense requirements, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe;

(15) insure that State and local civil defense organizations receiving Federal financial or other contributions will comply with the terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary, including the conditions that the contributions shall be used for civil defense purposes and in conformity with the national plan for civil defense; and

(16) conduct civil defense training exercises and make such other preattack preparations as in the judgment of the Secretary will improve the civil defense of the United States.

TITLE III—TRANSFERS OF FUNCTIONS

Transfer of Federal civil disaster functions

SEC. 301. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary all of the functions vested in the Federal Civil Defense Administrator and the Federal Civil Defense Administration under the act entitled "An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes," approved September 30, 1950, as provided for in Executive Order Numbered 10427 (dated January 16, 1953).

Transfer of office of defense mobilization civil defense functions

SEC. 302. There are hereby transferred to the Secretary all of the functions vested by any statute, reorganization plan, or Executive order in the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, or in the Office of Defense Mobilization, which pertain to the duties and functions of the Secretary as prescribed in title II of this act. To give effect to this section, the President shall determine which of the functions of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization or of the Office of Defense Mobilization shall be performed by the Secretary in accordance with this act and shall make appropriate provision for their transfer within a period of 90 days following the date of enactment of this act.

Transfer of records, personnel, etc.

SEC. 303. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary all personnel, property, records, obligations, and commitments of the Federal Civil Defense Administration (including those originally transferred to such Administration by section 404 of the Federal

Civil Defense Act of 1950), and all unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available (or to be made available) to such Administration.

(b) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary so much of the personnel, property, records, obligations, and commitments of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and so much of any unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (or to be made available) to such Office, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to be attributable to or required for the performance of the functions transferred under section 302. Funds transferred under this subsection may be merged or consolidated with funds transferred under subsection (a) which are available for the same purpose.

References to transferred functions

SEC. 304. Any reference to the Federal Civil Defense Administration or the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, or to the Office of Defense Mobilization or the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in any other law, delegation, rule, regulation, certificate, directive, instruction, or other official action in force on the effective date of this act, where applicable to functions transferred under this act, shall be deemed to refer and apply to the Department or the Secretary, respectively.

Effect of existing official actions

SEC. 305. (a) Notwithstanding the preceding sections of this title, all delegations of authority by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, and all defense mobilization orders of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization relating to functions transferred under section 302, as well as all other orders, regulations, certificates, directives, issuances, and other official actions relating to functions transferred under this act which are in force on the date of such transfer, shall continue in full force and effect until modified, amended, superseded, or revoked by the Secretary.

(b) Notwithstanding the preceding sections of this title, all boards, councils, committees, and similar organizations and groups established by the Federal Civil Defense Administration or the Office of Defense Mobilization pursuant to law which relate directly to any of the functions transferred to the Secretary under this act may be abolished or continued by action of the Secretary.

(c) Arrangements for representation of the Federal Civil Defense Administration or the Office of Defense Mobilization on inter-agency committees, panels, or working groups which on the date of enactment of this act are performing duties relating to functions transferred under this act shall continue in effect until modified, amended, superseded, or revoked by the Secretary.

Abolition of Federal Civil Defense Administration

SEC. 306. The Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the Offices of Federal Civil Defense Administrator and Deputy Administrator, are abolished; and the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 is repealed.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Employment of personnel

SEC. 401. In the performance of his duties and functions, the Secretary is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Department. Such officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and the compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that to the extent that the Secretary deems such action necessary to the discharge of his duties and functions, scientific or technical personnel possessing special qualifications or required for excep-

tional duties may be employed, and their compensation fixed, without regard to such laws.

Employment of temporary personnel

SEC. 402. The Secretary is authorized to employ such part-time or temporary advisory personnel as he deems necessary in carrying out his duties and functions. Such personnel, while so employed, may serve without compensation or may receive compensation of not to exceed \$50 per diem (as determined by the Secretary) and shall receive their transportation expenses and not to exceed \$20 per diem in lieu of subsistence.

Establishment of advisory boards

SEC. 403. The Secretary is authorized to establish such advisory boards, in addition to those provided for in this act, as he deems necessary in carrying out his duties and functions. Persons holding other offices or positions of the United States for which they receive compensation, while serving as members of such advisory boards, shall receive no additional compensation for such service. Other members of advisory boards, while serving as such, may serve without compensation or may receive compensation of not to exceed \$50 per diem (as determined by the Secretary) and shall receive their necessary transportation expenses and not to exceed \$20 in lieu of subsistence.

Procurement of property

SEC. 404. The Secretary may procure by condemnation or otherwise, construct, or lease (with the right to take immediate possession thereof), and transport, maintain, store, renovate, distribute, or redistribute, any materials, equipment, facilities, or other real or personal property for civil defense purposes: *Provided*, That property acquired by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this act, prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 255): *Provided further*, That proceedings for condemnation under this section shall be instituted and conducted in accordance with and subject to the provisions of law and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure which are generally applicable to the acquisition of real property, through condemnation proceedings, by officers of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That real property actions by or for the use of the Department shall be subject to the provisions of sections 601 through 604 of the act of September 28, 1951 (40 U. S. C., secs. 551-554): *Provided further*, That the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, where applicable and not otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall govern the procurement of property under this act.

Disposal of property

SEC. 405. Except as otherwise prescribed in this act, the Secretary is authorized to arrange for the sale or disposal of materials, equipment, and facilities found by the Secretary to be unnecessary or unsuitable for civil-defense purposes in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Utilization of Federal agencies

SEC. 406. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the personnel, services, materials, and facilities of Federal departments and agencies and to reimburse any Federal department or agency for any of its expenditures or for compensation of its personnel and utilization or consumption of its services, materials, and facilities under this act to the extent funds are available.

Utilization of other services

SEC. 407. The Secretary is authorized to accept and utilize the services of State and

local civil agencies; utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services by individuals or organizations as might from time to time be needed; and authorize the States to establish and organize such individuals and organizations into units to be known collectively as the United States Civil Defense Corps: *Provided*, That the members of such corps shall not be deemed by reason of such membership to be appointees or employees of the United States.

Acceptance of supplies, etc.

SEC. 408. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized to accept gifts of supplies, equipment, and facilities; and utilize and distribute the same for civil-defense purposes in accordance with the provisions of this act.

Purchase of printing work

SEC. 409. The Secretary is authorized to purchase such printing, binding, and blank-book work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies as the Secretary may deem necessary upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U. S. C., sec. 14).

Identity insignia

SEC. 410. The Secretary is authorized to purchase insignia, armbands, and other distinctive articles (including designs previously covered under letters patent which were assigned to the United States and held by the Office of Civilian Defense created by Executive Order No. 8757, issued May 20, 1941) which may be manufactured for or possessed or worn by persons engaged in civil defense activities pursuant to rules and regulations for the manufacture, possession, or wearing thereof established by the Secretary. The manufacture, possession, or wearing of any such insignia, armband, or other distinctive article otherwise than in accordance with such rules and regulations shall be unlawful, and shall subject such persons to a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both.

Exemption from certain provisions

SEC. 411. The authority granted in section 402 shall be exercised in accordance with regulations of the President who may also provide by regulation for the exemption of persons who are employed or whose services are utilized under the authority of such sections from the operation of sections 281, 283, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 99).

Security regulations

SEC. 412. (a) The Secretary shall establish such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property as he deems necessary. No employee of the Department shall be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which access restrictions have been established under this section, until it shall have been determined that no information is contained in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or any other investigative agency of the Government indicating that such employee is of questionable loyalty or reliability for security purposes, or, if any such information is so disclosed, until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have conducted a full field investigation concerning such person and a report thereon shall have been evaluated in writing by the Secretary. No employee of the Department shall occupy any position determined by the Secretary to be of critical importance from the standpoint of national security until a full field investigation concerning such employee shall have been conducted by the Civil Service Commission and a report thereon shall have been evaluated in writing by the Secretary. In the event such

full field investigation by the Civil Service Commission develops any data reflecting that such applicant for a position of critical importance is of questionable loyalty or reliability for security purposes, or if the Secretary for any other reason shall deem it to be advisable, such investigation shall be discontinued and a report thereon shall be referred to the Secretary for his evaluation in writing. Thereafter the Secretary may refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation by such Bureau. The result of such latter investigation by such Bureau shall be furnished to the Secretary for his action.

(b) Each Federal employee of the Department shall execute the loyalty oath and appointment affidavits prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. Each person other than a Federal employee who is appointed to serve in a State or local organization for civil defense shall, before entering upon his duties, take an oath in writing before a person authorized to administer oaths, which oath shall be substantially as follows:

"I, ———, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties upon which I am about to enter.

"And I do further swear (or affirm) that I do not advocate, nor am I a member or an affiliate of any organization, group, or combination of persons that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence; and that during such time as I am a member of the ——— (name of civil defense organization), I will not advocate nor become a member or an affiliate of any organization, group, or combination of persons that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence."

After appointment and qualification for office, the director of civil defense of any State, and any subordinate civil defense officer within such State designated by the director in writing, shall be qualified to administer such oath within such State under such regulations as the director shall prescribe. Any person who shall be found guilty of having falsely taken such oath shall be punished as provided in section 1621 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Appropriations and transfers of funds

Sec. 413. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Funds made available for the purposes of this act may be allocated or transferred for any of the purposes of this act, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any Federal department, agency, or Government corporation; but each such allocation or transfer shall be reported in full detail to the Congress within 30 days after such allocation or transfer.

Annual report to the Congress

Sec. 414. In addition to any other reports prescribed in this act, the Secretary shall annually submit a written report to the President and the Congress covering expenditures, contributions, work, and accomplishments of the Department pursuant to this act, accompanied by such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate.

Definitions

Sec. 415. As used in this act, the terms "United States," "State," and "States" include the several States, the Territories and possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Separability

Sec. 416. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE V—EMERGENCY AUTHORITY

Declaration of policy

Sec. 501. In enacting this title it is the policy and intent of Congress to preserve the supremacy of civilian rule under emergency conditions to the greatest possible extent. While recognizing that in the event of enemy attack military rule may be necessary in certain areas and under exceptional circumstances, the Congress intends that such rule shall be strictly limited in time and place and instituted only to serve urgent and immediate military requirements. The Congress further intends that military resources and personnel, when available for civil defense operations, shall be utilized under the general supervision and direction of the Secretary, and that the Secretary should, it become necessary to exercise his authority under this title, shall receive the wholehearted cooperation and fullest assistance of the Department of Defense and military authorities consistent with their defense missions, in a common endeavor to protect and defend the people and preserve the integrity of the United States.

National civil defense emergency

Sec. 502. The provisions of this title shall be operative only during the existence of a state of civil defense emergency (hereinafter referred to in this title as an "emergency"). The existence of an emergency within the United States or any part thereof may be proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress if the President in such proclamation, or the Congress in such resolution, finds that an attack upon the United States has occurred or is anticipated and the national safety therefore requires an invocation of the provisions of this title. Any emergency shall terminate upon the proclamation of the termination thereof by the President, or the passage by the Congress of a concurrent resolution terminating such emergency.

Emergency powers

Sec. 503. During the period of an emergency the Secretary is authorized to carry out all the civil-defense operations required by the national plan of civil defense provided in title II of this act and to exercise all the duties and functions prescribed in this act: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exercise the authority contained in title IV on such terms and conditions as the President shall determine (subject to the provisions of this title) and without regard to the limitations of existing law: *Provided further*, That any funds received from the sale or other disposition, during the period of an emergency, of materials or for services shall be deposited to the credit of appropriations currently available and made pursuant to this act and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of such appropriations.

Additional emergency powers

Sec. 504. During the period of an emergency the Secretary is further authorized to—

- (1) requisition materials, supplies, equipment, and other personal and real property, whether privately or publicly owned, necessary for civil-defense purposes;
- (2) coordinate and direct for civil-defense purposes the activities of the various Federal departments and agencies of the United States and utilize such of their personnel, services, materials, supplies, equipment, and other personal and real property as the President shall determine are not required for

military purposes, under such conditions as to donation, compensation, or return as the President may prescribe;

(3) incur such obligations on behalf of the United States as may be required to meet the civil-defense requirements of an actual or anticipated attack;

(4) direct and supervise civil-defense operations of the States and the political subdivisions;

(5) assume control and operation of any State or local government when requested by its duly elected or appointed chief executive;

(6) reimburse any State, including any political subdivisions thereof, for the compensation paid to and the transportation, subsistence, and maintenance expenses of any employees while engaged in rendering civil-defense aid outside the State and to pay fair and reasonable compensation for the materials of the State government or any political subdivision utilized or consumed outside of the State, including any transportation costs, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary. As used in this paragraph, the term "employees" shall include full- or part-time paid, volunteer, auxiliary, and civil-defense workers subject to the order or control of a State government or any political subdivision thereof, and such employees shall not be deemed by reason of such reimbursement to be employees or appointees of the United States; and

(7) provide financial assistance for the temporary relief or aid of any civilian injured or in want as the result of any attack.

Reports on emergency actions

Sec. 505. During the period of an emergency, the Secretary shall keep the President fully informed and shall submit quarterly to the Congress a detailed report concerning all action taken pursuant to this title.

Immunity from suit

Sec. 506. The Federal Government shall not be liable for any damage to property or for any death or personal injury occurring directly or indirectly as a result of the exercise or performance of, or failure to exercise or perform, any function or duty, by any Federal agency or employee of the Government, in carrying out the provisions of this title during the period of an emergency. Nothing contained in this section shall affect the right of any person to receive any benefit or compensation to which he might otherwise be entitled under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U. S. C., sec. 751 and the following), or any other Act of Congress providing for any pension or retirement benefits.

Waiver of Administrative Procedure Act

Sec. 507. During the period of an emergency, the functions and duties exercised under this act shall not be subject to the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C., sec. 1001 and the following), except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

Compensation for nongovernmental property acquired

Sec. 508. (a) Except in the case of property acquired pursuant to section 404 of this act in conformity with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, or through judicial proceedings for condemnation, the Secretary shall promptly determine the amount of the compensation to be paid for any property (other than that of the Federal Government or any department or agency thereof, or that of any State or political subdivision thereof) or the use thereof acquired pursuant to this act, but each such determination shall be made as of the time it is acquired in accordance with the provisions for just compensation in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If the person entitled to receive the amount

so determined by the Secretary as just compensation is unwilling to accept such amount as full and complete compensation for such property or the use thereof, he shall be paid promptly 75 percent of such amount and shall be entitled to recover from the United States, in an action brought in the Court of Claims, or, without regard to whether the amount involved exceeds \$10,000, in any district court of the United States, within 3 years after the date of the Secretary's award, such additional amount, if any, as, when added to the amount so paid to him, shall be just compensation.

(b) Whenever the Secretary determines that any real property acquired by him under this title is no longer needed for the purposes of this act, he shall, if the person from whom the property was acquired desires the return of the property and pays to the Secretary the then fair value thereof, return such property to such owner. In the event the Secretary and the original owner do not agree as to the fair value of such property, the fair value shall be determined by three appraisers, one of whom shall be chosen by the Secretary, one by the person from whom the property was acquired, and the third by the first two appraisers; and the expenses of such determination shall be paid in equal shares by the Government and the person from whom the property was acquired.

(c) Whenever the need for the purposes of this act of any personal property acquired by him under this title shall terminate, the Secretary may dispose of such property on such terms and conditions as he shall deem appropriate, but to the extent feasible and practicable he shall give to the person from whom the property was acquired an opportunity to reacquire it (1) at its then fair value as determined by the Secretary, or (2) if it is to be disposed of (otherwise than at a public sale of which he shall give reasonable notice) at less than such value, at the highest price any other person is willing to pay therefor; but such opportunity to reacquire need not be given in the case of fungibles or items having a fair value of less than \$1,000.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF NEW CIVIL DEFENSE BILL DECLARATION OF POLICY

Congressional policy is restated to affirm that civil defense is squarely a Federal responsibility and a vital part of the national defense. At the same time the important supporting role of the States and local units of government is recognized, as well as the essentially nonmilitary nature of civil defense.

A NEW DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Title I of the bill would establish a new executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, headed by a Secretary, in place of the existing Federal Civil Defense Administration. Elevation of FCDA to regular departmental status was recommended in the subcommittee report and is endorsed by various groups, including the American Legion.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF DEPARTMENT

Besides the Secretary of Civil Defense, the bill provides for a Deputy Secretary, an Administrative Assistant Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries and a General Counsel, each to be appointed by the President with Senate approval, at rates of compensation comparable to those for such officers in the Department of Defense.

MILITARY LIAISON COMMITTEE

To provide a two-way channel of communications and cooperative working relationships with the military, the bill provides in title I for a Military Liaison Committee representing the three military departments and a chairman appointed by the President with Senate approval. The setup of the committee is patterned on the one

provided by law for the Atomic Energy Commission. The Military Liaison Committee and the Secretary of Civil Defense would be obligated to advise and consult on civil defense matters of mutual interest, several of which are set forth specifically in the bill.

SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

The bill also provides in title I for a Scientific Advisory Board of 12 members of outstanding scientific ability, selected by the President and serving for 6-year staggered terms. As with the Military Liaison Committee, this board is patterned on the one provided by law for the Atomic Energy Commission. The new statutory board would replace the loose contractual arrangement which FCDA now has with the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, and would bring much-needed scientific talent to civil defense.

CIVIL DEFENSE ADVISORY COUNCIL

The bill finally provides in title I for a Civil Defense Advisory Council of 15 members serving for staggered 4-year terms, appointed by the President, with the Secretary of Civil Defense acting as Chairman. An advisory group is provided for in existing civil-defense legislation, but has been little used. The new council would give statutory representation not only to State and local government but to industry, labor, and the public. Broad representation of this kind would serve to link Federal civil-defense activities with normal peacetime pursuits.

SUMMARY OF TITLE I

The first title is thus an organizational measure, transforming FCDA into a regular department of Government, establishing a Military Liaison Committee as a bridge to the military, a Scientific Advisory Board as a bridge to science, and a Civil Defense Advisory Council, as a bridge to local, industrial, and civic interests.

NATIONAL PLAN OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Title II would require the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and with the appropriate State and local officials, to prepare and execute a national plan of civil defense for the United States. This follows a major recommendation in the subcommittee report for a master plan of civil defense based on the testimony of many informed witnesses.

Fourteen broad objectives of the national plan are set forth in the bill to forestall or minimize the effects of an enemy attack. These include such things as attack warning, information to the public, shelter, control of traffic, radiological monitoring, rescue and welfare services, and restoration of essential industry. Note that the objectives are not narrowly conceived as temporary rescue services, but extend to placing the national economy back on its feet after an enemy attack. Thus, the Secretary of Civil Defense would be responsible for postattack operations now illogically divided between FCDA and ODM.

Note also that the objectives are derived from the broad definition of civil defense contained in the 1950 legislation. In effect, the components of that definition have been translated into substantive law, so that they become an operating rather than a semantic definition of civil defense.

EXECUTION OF NATIONAL PLAN

Having set forth the broad objectives of a national plan of civil defense, title II then specifies some 16 civil-defense functions in execution of the national plan which are mandatory upon the Secretary of Civil Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the appropriate State and local officials. These functions include defining target areas, systematic action to reduce target vulnerability, group-shelter construction in each target area, establishment of warning and communications systems,

stockpiling necessary equipment, training and research, continuous review of Federal programs for civil-defense aspects, integration of civil and military plans for passive defense, assistance to State and local civil-defense organizations through contributions, and civil-defense training exercises and other preattack preparations.

The provisions for assisting State and local civil-defense organizations do not specify any matching requirements or ratio of Federal to State-local contributions, but leave such determinations to the Secretary of Civil Defense, with the conditions that Federal contributions be used for civil-defense purposes and in conformity with the national plan for civil defense. Also, the shelter program is made a Federal activity, authorizing the Secretary to make such arrangements for commercial or civic use of group shelters as he considers appropriate.

SUMMARY OF TITLE II

This title seeks to redefine Federal civil-defense functions making mandatory a national plan of civil defense and making the Secretary of Civil Defense responsible for the preparation and execution of such a plan. This contrasts with the 1950 legislation, which not only relieves the Federal Government of major responsibility for civil defense but which also leaves the FCDA Administrator's responsibilities in a rather indeterminate status.

TRANSFER OF DISASTER FUNCTIONS

Having established the new organizational base of civil defense (title I) and having restated its basic functions (title II) the bill proceeds in title III to make certain transfers of existing functions associated with civil defense. Thus, the new Department would acquire the civil-disaster functions now vested in the President and delegated to FCDA by Executive order. Since this bill would supersede the 1950 civil-defense legislation, the transfer of civil-disaster functions is made necessary to keep them in being under civil-defense direction.

TRANSFER OF ODM CIVIL-DEFENSE FUNCTIONS

The other reorganization step in title III, following a recommendation in the subcommittee report, is to eliminate overlapping or divided authority between FCDA and ODM in the civil-defense field. Those functions of ODM which the President determines to be of a civil-defense nature and more appropriately exercised by the Secretary of Civil Defense would be shifted over to the new department. The bill does not attempt to specify what functions should be extracted from ODM since they are somewhat vague and their present exercise is without benefit of a clear legislative mandate. ODM is largely an executive creation, having been first created by Executive order and having been formalized by Presidential reorganization plan. Consequently it is considered appropriate for the President to make further necessary reorganizations in this field for a 90-day period, under authority in title III of the bill.

Note that the merger of civil-defense functions would not mean a complete elimination of ODM. Insofar as it is an advisory organ to the President in the mobilization field or administers certain statutory functions, the ODM still carries on, but the Secretary of Civil Defense rather than the ODM Director would be responsible for such civil defense matters as location of Government buildings, post-attack restoration of essential industry, and the like.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Title IV provides for various necessary activities of the new department such as the employment of personnel, property procurement and disposal, and the like. Mainly these provisions are those in the 1950 legislation. No change is made, for example, in the personnel security procedures.

EMERGENCY AUTHORITY

Title V deals with the emergency situations created by expected or actual enemy attack. The 1950 legislation had a similar title but the bill makes several important changes. First of all, this title carries a declaration of congressional policy, making it clear that the Congress intends to retain strong civilian direction of civil defense in any emergency. The possibility of martial law is recognized but its use is to be limited in time and place and to be resorted to only for urgent and immediate military requirements. The military role is conceived to be one of full cooperation and assistance to civil authorities consistent with military missions.

During an emergency, which may be declared by the President or the Congress, the Secretary is authorized to carry out the civil-defense operations required by the national plan of civil defense, but is relieved from certain legal restrictions on procurement, employment of personnel, and the like. Also the Secretary would be authorized to requisition supplies, to coordinate and direct civil-defense operations of the Federal Government, to direct and supervise State and local civil-defense operations, and if necessary to assume control and operation of any State or local government. The duly elected or appointed chief executive of the State or local government would decide when a breakdown of civil government under his jurisdiction required the Federal authority to take over.

The purpose of such emergency authority is to create a civilian government substitute for military rule and martial law. Such an arrangement is patterned on the Presidential proclamations for exercise of Federal authority issued during Operation Alert 1956.

A PROPOSAL TO CREATE A NEW DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, events of the past months in Europe and the Middle East and the President's message to Congress January 5 have brought into sharp focus that often it is only a very small factor that determines whether there shall be war or peace. The turmoil in the Middle East, the uprisings in Hungary, and now our President's important declaration of policy to the Congress certainly has shaken the American people from any drift of complacency that may have existed concerning the questions of defense, of our Nation and of the free world.

No longer do we have the arguments raging over whether we shall or shall not have a peacetime military force. Indeed, that is almost ancient history. Our debates today concern whether what we have is enough to deter any aggressor from making the fatal mistake of engaging in war with this Nation. Only few would deny that one of the free world's most effective means of keeping peace is through an armed might capable of destroying any nation that would gamble on war as a method of solving international difficulties.

Today's peace hinges greatly on one main point, our country's strength, a factor that carries tremendous weight in the minds of those who would conquer

the world if they thought the opportunity ripe for such an onslaught.

A part of that strength lies in an effective military force, which we are fortunate to possess. The other part of that strength is our civil-defense organization. These two great units, a strong military force and a highly coordinated, strengthened civil-defense program form a powerful deterrent to the ambitions of any aggressor as well as providing maximum security for this Nation. Our President has outlined one phase of our program devoted to keeping the peace—a program concerning areas of the free world presently endangered. Civil defense plays an equally important role in our Nation's security and must be coordinated to the extent that both our military-defense and civil-defense organizations know constantly what the other is doing and is capable of doing.

Today, I offer a bill which provides for a revision of our present civil defense program that would give this Nation a highly-effective organization closely coordinated with our present Armed Forces' Establishment and our State and local government units upon which we are dependent.

The purpose of this bill is not to create another Federal agency, but to create an organization which can adapt the new concepts of the military into a coordinated program of readiness and action, capable of meeting any future involvement that may be thrust upon us. Through such preparation and capability I am certain we would be making an investment in a security that would be the strongest guaranty we could have for preserving the peace.

Certainly we have dedicated men and women who are working diligently for maintenance of a successful civil defense program. These people are to be commended for their untiring efforts. But they have been handicapped immeasurably because the present program is not designed to meet the present day needs and will not meet these needs if continued in the same form.

Civil defense has been thought of in the past as a program which would be made effective should troops invade our shores and enemy planes bomb our cities and industries. But civil defense is more than that, it is a program designed to show that this country is prepared, from the Pentagon to the main street, for any eventuality. Our armed might certainly stands as formidable power to an aggressor. And our civil defense can also stand as a great moral and physical strength—it can show the enemy that we are not weak in any respect, but that our strength and resistance is everywhere in this Nation.

Civil defense also is the key to our own preservation should we suffer enemy attack. With an energetic, efficient and far-reaching civil defense program our Nation will be equipped to survive the devastation of war, and better than ever before, with losses minimized and production continued.

Without a survival program, which actually is what civil defense is, this Nation, within a very short time, could be brought to its knees. Our industries could be halted permanently, our people

could be terrorized into panic, and without either industry or the men and women to operate these plants, our effectiveness would be reduced immeasurably.

We have entered into a new era—the atomic age, in which weapons so powerful can wipe out entire areas. It is time for our civil-defense program to enter this age also, to become an integral part of our national defense planning, so as to provide our country with a program of survival designed to meet any eventuality.

The bill which I introduce, and which is the product of many months of study and hearings, calls for a reorganization of the civil defense functions of the Federal Government and will establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense. Under this bill civil defense will become an executive department of the Government, with a Secretary of Cabinet status who would become a member of the National Security Council.

The intent of this bill should in no way be construed as removing from the States and local governments the authority and responsibility which they must continue to undertake for the well-being and security of our people.

Important to the organization of civil defense, as provided in this bill, are three groups appointed to participate in the functions of the department. The groups are: military liaison committee, scientific advisory board and civil defense advisory council.

Representatives from the Army, Navy and Air Force would serve on the military liaison committee. The chairman would be appointed by the President. This committee is to advise and consult with the Secretary of Civil Defense in all Department of Defense matters relating to civil defense.

The Scientific Advisory Board is to be composed of 12 members of outstanding scientific ability and would be appointed by the President. The Board, which would elect its own Chairman, is to advise the Secretary on scientific and technical matters and shall make periodic evaluations and recommendations of current civil-defense projects and programs.

The third group, a Civil Defense Advisory Council to confer on general policies, will consist of 15 members appointed by the President, and the Secretary who shall be Chairman. Representatives would include 3 from State government, 3 representing political subdivisions of the States, 3 from industry, 3 representing labor, and 3 to be selected from among citizens of broad and varied experience in matters affecting the public interest.

The bill provides that the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and other officials, shall prepare and execute a national plan of civil defense in event of anticipated or actual enemy attack.

The 14-point plan includes provisions for: First, clear and prompt warning to the civilian population; second, public information as to immediate measures which must be taken to minimize the effects of enemy action; third, shelter of civilian population against primary and

secondary effects of nuclear explosions; fourth, control of traffic, lighting, and civil communications; fifth, enforcement of civil-defense regulations; sixth, evacuation of persons from target areas when evacuation is feasible; seventh, food, clothing, medical, health, sanitation, welfare, and other services for sheltered, displaced, and evacuated persons; eighth, monitoring for radiological, biological, and chemical hazards; ninth, decontamination of areas, facilities, and supplies subjected to such hazards; tenth, unexploded bomb reconnaissance and disposition; eleventh, fire fighting, rescue, debris clearance, and other emergency services; twelfth, movement of essential personnel to places of employment; thirteenth, repair or restoration of essential industry, communications, transportation, utility, and other facilities; and fourteenth, resumption and continuity of essential industrial production, economic activities, and governmental functions and services.

A 16-point program is outlined for execution of the Nation plan which includes: First, define potential target areas and determine their relative importance; second, institute systematic measures to reduce vulnerability of such target areas to enemy attack; third, construct group shelters in each target area and make arrangements for their maintenance; fourth, establish and maintain warning and communications systems or devices and control centers; fifth, procure, stockpile, and store in strategic locations necessary medical supplies and equipment, foodstuffs, industrial, transportation, communications, utility, and other materials, supplies, and equipment; sixth, establish and operate technical schools and training centers and provide expert instruction and training in civil defense; seventh, provide timely, periodic, and authoritative information to State and local civil-defense officials and to the public concerning civil-defense measures and requirements; eighth, establish civil defense research laboratories and conduct research directly or by contract; ninth, provide advisory services to industry concerning plant location and protection, participation in civil-defense training and exercises and other civil-defense activities; tenth, continuously review Federal programs for their civil-defense aspects and make recommendations to the President and Congress concerning administrative or legislative changes to conform such programs to civil-defense requirements; eleventh, direct, with approval of the President, other Federal departments and agencies to undertake specific civil-defense projects or programs; twelfth, establish regional, area, and local offices and civil-defense organizational arrangements; thirteenth, integrate civil-defense measures with those for the protection of military, atomic, and other defense installations; fourteenth, assist State and local civil-defense organizations by cooperating in financing for personnel and administrative expenses and other requirements; fifteenth, insure that State and local civil-defense organizations receiving Federal assistance comply with terms and conditions pre-

scribed by the Secretary; and sixteenth, conduct civil-defense training exercises and make such other preattack preparations as needed.

The bill also provides for transfer of all functions of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and certain functions of the Office of Defense Mobilization to the Secretary of Civil Defense.

In addition to the major change of establishing civil defense as a regular executive department of the Government, as provided in this bill, other important provisions should be noted which place civil defense as a part of our total military-defense program.

The scientific advisory board will bring much-needed scientific talent to civil defense and will offer a highly coordinated program to replace the present system which has not been utilized to the fullest. Provision for a civil-defense advisory council gives statutory representation to State and local government, industry, labor, and the public, and for the first time would provide a definite connection between Federal civil defense and normal peacetime activities.

Placing functions of the FCDA and ODM under one program will result in coordination of both purpose and activities, while the national plan takes on a much broader objective in that its purpose also is aimed at restoring our national economy following enemy attack.

The new department also receives clear determination as to its role in our Nation's defense pattern as well as acquiring civil-disaster functions now vested in the President and delegated to the FCDA by Executive order.

Emergency authority is granted to the Secretary of Civil Defense under this bill, but it also is made clear that the purpose of emergency authority is to create a civilian government substitute for military rule and martial law. The military role in a national emergency is to be one of full cooperation and assistance to civil authorities consistent with military missions.

I have stated in the past that our civil-defense program is dangerously outmoded. Should a national emergency arise, I am not at all certain that under our present civil-defense system we could cope successfully with a disaster of national proportion.

I am convinced that legislation providing for reorganization of our civil-defense program is long overdue, and to neglect or ignore this vital arm so necessary to our self-preservation could lead to our own destruction.

It is my most earnest hope that this 85th Congress will take the steps that result in revising and revitalizing our civil-defense program—steps that could well rank in importance with other great efforts to keep the peace.

It should also be pointed out that the bill introduced today is a draft of proposed legislation and does not constitute the final form in which the bill may appear. Committee hearings will be held, at which time we will hear various witnesses, and it is expected changes will be made in the bill through committee action.

THE HONORABLE JAMES P. RICHARDS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to announce that one of our former colleagues, the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Honorable James P. Richards, has a new assignment. He was appointed as special assistant to the President with the rank of an Ambassador and will head the special mission to the Middle East. I am sure that all of his colleagues, as I do, wish him well. I am sure we all join his host of friends and admirers in extending to him our best wishes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, would welcome this splendid appointment. Our former chairman had the respect and the affection of the Congress on both sides of the Capitol, on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe the President has made a wise decision in choosing our former chairman for that post.

TITO VISIT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the newspapers reported that the President of the United States was about to issue an invitation to Dictator Tito, of Yugoslavia, to visit Washington.

Tito's record as a Communist tyrant and the numerous murders and massacres inflicted on innocent people within the borders of Yugoslavia should forever bar him from being invited by the leaders of our free democracy to visit our shores. He personifies antifreedom, antireligion, antidemocracy, and anti-labor. His record as a noncompromising and ruthless tyrant should estop any recognition and honor which our Government would extend to him by an invitation to the White House.

I have received a great number of protests from citizens and organizations in the Calumet region in Indiana asking that President Eisenhower refuse to invite this dictator to Washington.

I hereby incorporate with my remarks a telegram received from Mr. John T. Marich, honorary president of the Gary chapter of the Serbian National Council of America.

GARY, IND., December 23, 1956.

HON. RAY MADSEN,
Congressman, First District of Indiana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The general press of the United States has been flooded with the most devastating and disgraceful news of President Eisenhower's pending invitation of the Yugoslavia Dictator Tito to visit the United States. As one of the citizens of Serbian descent who have been voting for the last 55 years for a better and fuller democracy of the United States, I vigorously and indignantly protest against the disgraceful and dangerous act of the White House of inviting the dictator and murderer of so many Serbian democracy-loving people, including my own immediate relatives, to honor him with the White House invitation to visit this country and thereby impliedly, if not actually, sanction and approve of his fiendish deeds of the killing of the liberty-loving Serbian people, as well as American aviators. Every self-respecting Serbian in America will suffer agony from shame for his adopted country, America, to compromise its world's prestige by such an unthinkable invitation.

I ask you, Congressman, to lodge a strong protest on the Congress floor in behalf of the Serbian people and all other democratic-loving people of the United States against the President's invitation of Dictator Tito.

JOHN T. MARICH,
Honorary President of the Gary
Chapter of the Serbian National
Council of America.

MAKING INAUGURATION DAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY IN METROPOLITAN AREA OF DISTRICT OF CO- LUMBIA

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1—making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 20th day of January 1957 and the 20th day of January in every fourth year thereafter, known as Inauguration Day, is hereby made a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia for the purpose of all statutes relating to the compensation and leave of employees of the United States, including the legislative and judicial branches, and of the District of Columbia, employed in such area: *Provided, however,* That whenever the 20th day of January in any such year shall fall on a Sunday, the next succeeding day selected for the public observance of the inauguration of the President of the United States shall be considered a legal holiday as provided by this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "metropolitan area of the District of Columbia" shall include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery, and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is similar to one I introduced at the beginning of the session. It provides on a permanent basis a holiday for Inauguration Day for Federal employees in the District of Columbia

area. This will include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland; Arlington and Fairfax Counties in Virginia; and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va.

Traditionally schools in this area have been excused on Inauguration Day. For the past several inaugurations arrangements have been made for the Federal employees to be given a holiday in order that they may observe the historical and important activities in connection with the inauguration. By making this a permanent arrangement—one which will occur only once every 4 years—my resolution will eliminate the necessity for acting upon this matter on every inauguration. It will provide for uniformity.

Four years ago I introduced a similar resolution directed toward the Inauguration Day of 1953. This resolution was approved by the House.

With the intensive and exciting activities of Inauguration Day, it would be most difficult for employees to get to and from work in this area or to perform satisfactorily their functions once at their desks.

Heads of departments and agencies can, of course, under my resolution, provide for the manning of necessary posts where for special public reasons employees must be on duty on Inauguration Day.

This resolution does not authorize an additional legal holiday. It merely takes care of a situation that happily occurs every 4 years in the United States and affects only the working situation of the employees around the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 2251, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following members on the part of the House:

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]; the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]; and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

HON. SAM RAYBURN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 6, 1957, and tomorrow, January

8, 1957, mark two significant anniversaries in the life of a great American.

Yesterday was the birthday anniversary of our great Speaker. Tomorrow marks his 50th anniversary as a legislator. It was on January 8, 50 years ago, that SAM RAYBURN, in the year 1907, at the age of 25, held up his hand for the first time and took the oath of office as a member of a legislative body. At that time, 50 years ago, he became a member of the Texas House of Representatives. Four years later he became the youngest speaker of the Texas House. He was then 29 years of age. The next year he came to this Congress, and, as I think most of you know, he has been here ever since.

Mr. RAYBURN's 50 years of legislative service, including the 5 years in the Texas Legislature, is the most extensive service in American legislative bodies, according to the Library of Congress. The late Senator Carter Glass and Speaker Cannon ranked as near competitors with 46 years each. Senator Hayden of Arizona, Senator Hale of Maine, and Representative Sabath, of Illinois, follow with 45 years. These figures include service in State legislatures.

You may be interested in comparative information from other great democracies. William E. Gladstone was about the only man that Speaker RAYBURN can now seek to surpass. As far as the Library of Congress can tell, Mr. Gladstone served in the Parliament of Great Britain for 60 years. Arthur James Balfour served for 56 years. Sir Winston Churchill has now served 54 years, and Sir Winston is still serving.

Speaker RAYBURN has already surpassed any such record in France. Mr. Charles Freycinet served there for a total of 44 years.

Therefore, I think it very significant that we pause here today between two great anniversaries in the life of our distinguished Speaker—his birthday and, on tomorrow, the 50th anniversary of his official service to his State, to his Nation, and to the free world.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I join the gentleman from Louisiana in his eulogy and praise of our distinguished Speaker. May I say in behalf of all the Republicans that we appreciate the fine service rendered by Speaker RAYBURN. He is a great American, and the country has benefited greatly from his long and faithful services. May he have many years of further service and good health is the wish of all.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The people of Tennessee take great pride in the fact that our beloved and distinguished Speaker was born in the Volunteer State of Tennessee. I am confident that I express the true sentiment and feeling of all the Tennessee delegation in Congress as well as all the people of the State in conveying hearty congratulations and sincere

best wishes for many happy returns to our distinguished and beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The people of Texas of course are very proud of the distinguished Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. RAYBURN tells new Members of Congress, as he told me when I first came here and as he has told all new Members, that this body is one in which a Member can succeed or fail according to his own conduct and actions. That is, a Member has two constituencies. One constituency makes it possible for him to come here and remain here and thereby give him the opportunity to serve the people. The other constituency is represented by his colleagues, those with whom he serves here on the floor of the House. He must likewise get along with them in order to be of service to the people who make it possible for him to serve in this body. Mr. RAYBURN has many achievements to his credit as a Member of the Congress, and I would just like to mention one or two.

No. 1. Texas was deficient in road building. Texas was not alone. All States were in a similar position. The farmers were in the mud, in the sand. There was an effort to get farm-to-market roads, but that effort never was successful until Mr. RAYBURN, as Speaker of the House, refused to permit a bill to be brought before this body when he was Speaker in 1944 until the Committee on Roads—at that time it was the Committee on Roads—went back and agreed to earmark at least 30 percent of all Federal highway funds for farm-to-market roads. That started our farm-to-market road program in the United States. You know how successful it has been and how acceptable it has been to the people.

No. 2. Mr. RAYBURN was author of the Rural Electrification Administration Act. That act not only helped the farmers to receive the blessings of electricity, and one of the greatest blessings of mankind is electricity, but also created a great market. It created a good market for many other things. Since that law was passed under the leadership, guidance, and authorship of Speaker RAYBURN, the farmers of this country on REA lines have purchased more than \$15 billion of appliances of all kinds. So that created a great market for many manufactured products. Of course, we know what that means.

Those are just two things that I have mentioned in the life of this great statesman. I could mention a number of others, including Federal Securities Act, Stock Exchange Regulation Act, Federal Deposit Insurance Act, Soil, Water Conservation and Flood Control Acts, authorizing the Denison and Lavon Dams, Farm Price Support Act, Communications Act, GI bill of rights, and Social Security.

THE TRUE STORY OF THE LIFE OF SPEAKER RAYBURN SURPASSES ANY HORATIO ALGER STORY

The true story of Speaker RAYBURN's life is more interesting, touching, and dramatic than any Horatio Alger story ever written. His life discloses what a young man can do if he possesses certain qualities and virtues, even though he and his parents were poor in this world's goods.

Mr. RAYBURN started out 50 years ago when he first entered public service, as he is now, an honest, sincere, trustworthy and genuine man. His word has always been good. He has always been forthright and courageous in his methods and policies. His great success has been due to many factors, but most outstanding were fairness and justice toward all people with whom he came in contact.

It is my belief that every day of his life he has given much thought and study to ways and means of being of greater service to the people he has the honor to represent and to the Nation as a whole.

One of the greatest rewards of any public official is the knowledge that he has performed his duties without fear or favor. Anyone who has ever known Speaker RAYBURN knows that he has never been unduly influenced in casting any vote or taking any action affecting the interest of the people of the country; he has always been considerate and kind to people who visit his office and visit him personally, particularly new Members of Congress.

If, when I have served the allotted time in the Congress of the United States, it can be said that I have achieved certain things that are helpful to the people of our country, Speaker RAYBURN will be entitled to a royalty interest in all of any such achievements of mine due to the fact that he gave me the proper help, guidance, and leadership during my service in Congress with him.

It cannot be said of Speaker RAYBURN that he has no enemies because he has enemies. He has accomplished something. In his many achievements he has stepped on the toes of powerful, influential and some greedy people, who were violently opposed to his actions. I am reminded of what I heard many years ago about the person who had no enemies:

He has no enemies, you say,
My friend, your boast is poor,
He who hath mingled in the fray
Of duty, that the brave endure
Must have many foes.
If he has none, small is the work that he has done.
He has hit no traitor on the hip.
He has cast no cup from the perfumed lip.
He has never turned the wrong to right.
He has been a coward in the fight.

That is the reason that Speaker RAYBURN has some enemies. He has been a courageous man and never in his life one time has he ever been guilty of any action that could not be considered honorable and forthright.

SAM RAYBURN LIBRARY

The Sam Rayburn Foundation will complete the Sam Rayburn Library in the city of Bonham, Tex., within a few months.

It will, in a small way, recognize the greatness of this wonderful statesman.

In the library brochure that was prepared by friends of SAM RAYBURN in 1955 is found the following information:

SAM RAYBURN—AMERICAN

To close observers of the national scene and to his colleagues who have seen the Rayburn genius for persuasive legislative diplomacy through the decades he stands out in the history of his time as the great leader. It is one of his special talents to reconcile the judgments of men of strong conviction but of opposite views on controversial legislation. Basically, this was achieved by the respect and the confidence he had built up among his legislative friends and opponents for granite integrity and complete knowledge of the issues and the needs. The Rayburn influence in enabling the legislative branch to meet crisis after crisis in four decades of war and peace will go down as the outstanding major individual contribution to the events that have shaped United States and world history.

SAM RAYBURN was born on the Clinch River, Roane County, Tenn., January 6, 1882. At the age of 5 he moved from Tennessee and settled on a farm south of Windom, Tex. He attended country school at Flagg Springs, Tex. After receiving his bachelor of science degree from Mayo School, Commerce, now the East Texas State Teachers College, he studied law at the University of Texas in preparation for a legal profession. He embarked on his political career as a member of the Texas House of Representatives, serving from 1907 to 1913, the last 2 years as speaker of the house. He was elected to the 63d Congress of the United States in 1912, taking his seat on March 4, 1913, and has served continuously since.

In 1913 he became chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and as such pressed to enactment important legislation of historic significance. In 1937, as the Democratic majority leader, he was the first Texan to hold that position. In 1940 he became Speaker of the House, the second Texan ever elected to that high and respected post, and the 44th incumbent in the history of the United States. SAM RAYBURN has served as Speaker longer than any other man in history. During the 80th Congress and the 83d he was elected Democratic leader. The Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia in 1948 and the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1952 elected him permanent chairman. Again on January 5, 1955, RAYBURN was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives—the day preceding his 73d birthday. Altogether, he has been elected Speaker of the House 7 times: 1940, 1941, 1943, 1945, 1949, 1951, and 1955.

The Speaker of the House is first in presidential succession next to the Vice President.

I have been very close to my fellow Texan during my 28 years in the Congress. He has given fatherly aid to many a young man coming to Congress for the first time. As majority leader and as Speaker, he has been endowed with great powers but has used them sparingly because he relies more upon persuasion than coercion. He is a friend of the farmer, the worker, the aged, the businessman—and especially the small-business man—and a genuine friend of those who serve their country and their loved ones.

SAM RAYBURN is not only honest, able, and affable, but he is dependable and loyal. It can truthfully be said of him what Thomas Jefferson once said of a great public official, and that is, "You

could turn his soul inside out and not find a speck on it." His life conclusively reveals that he is guided by the teachings of the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount.

The Speaker typifies much of what is most attractive in American life. He is a man of simple faith and simple utterance; indignant in the presence of injustice and scornful of shame; restrained in his tastes and his pleasures; determined but not dogmatic; dignified but not pompous; hardworking, kind, and patient. Many men of his kind have sat in the House before him and helped direct America in the paths of greatness. He is a fine example of our kind of civilization, created and tempered by the peculiar conditions of American life. No Member of Congress is more anxious to assist one of his constituents or more eager to be of help to his own Congressional District than SAM RAYBURN. His national leadership has not in the least distracted his thoughts from his own constituents, about whom he often says, "I shall never cease to be grateful to the people, who make it possible for me to remain in Congress."

We in Texas and in Congress are proud of SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is natural and proper that the State of Tennessee be very proud of our distinguished Speaker for the fact that he was born in that great State, and that the State of Texas be very proud of our distinguished Speaker because of his residence and citizenship in that State for so many years. But, I might say, the entire United States is proud of SAM RAYBURN and the public service that he has rendered and which he typifies. To him public office is a public trust. He served in this great body during many trying periods in the history of our country and in the history of the world. He has always been found true. He has always acted with vision and with courage. Whenever the national interest of our country is involved, SAM RAYBURN always has given the type of leadership within the Halls of this body which was for the best interest of our country as a whole. He is tremendously respected by all Americans without regard to political affiliation. He is a sound progressive—and there is no political implication in the remark that I am about to make—but in the Halls of Congress, SAM RAYBURN pioneered and led the fight for the great reform measures of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in the years 1933 and following that time when he was chairman of that great and responsible committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

He led the fight for important measures in those days that are now accepted by a great majority of our people—and again without regard to political affiliations—as a necessary part of our domestic economy and our domestic strength.

From a personal angle SAM RAYBURN is a man with a heart of gold. He is a very sentimental gentleman. He has a

very warm heart. He is always trying to do something to help someone else. I have referred to him on several occasions in the past, and from a personal angle I think the best way to refer to him is as I did a few moments ago, that he is a man with a heart of gold.

He and I have been very closely associated with each other since my freshman days in the House. He has been very kind to me as a Member of the House and, during the last 17 years in our relationship to each other, he as Speaker and I as Democratic leader on the floor. I can say that my feeling of respect for SAM RAYBURN and deep friendship for him is the same inwardly when I am talking with friends of mine in my office and elsewhere, as it is when I express myself outwardly to the public.

My life and the life of all others who have had the honor to know this great man, and he is greater because he is humble, and he is greater because he is good, my life because of having known him has been enriched immeasurably.

Like the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] and all of my other colleagues I join with them in extending to our Speaker our congratulations and our felicitations on these two anniversaries, and we pray that God will continue to shower upon him for years to come an abundance of His choicest blessings.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Let me say for all the Florida delegation in Congress that on this day Florida proudly casts all of its sunshine votes for SAM RAYBURN. We are proud indeed to have an opportunity to pay homage and respect to this great American.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] upon the excellent statement he has made concerning the life and service of our beloved Speaker.

Secondly, on behalf of the people of my State who love SAM RAYBURN and look upon him as a Congressman at large from the State of Oklahoma, I extend our heartiest congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I want to add my congratulations to SAM RAYBURN for his long service in the House of Representatives, and for another birthday. I speak for myself and on behalf of all the Members of the Missouri delegation. We honor SAM RAYBURN not just for his longevity of service but for the gentleman that he is and for the many services that he has so efficiently rendered to all of the people of this great Nation of ours and to all of the people of the free world.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I would like to join in the tribute to our great Speaker. I think sometimes when we are living close to an historic character we do not realize it. The fact is, however, this man has served longer than anyone in the history of the Republic in the great office which he now holds, and that continuity of service is no accident but is a tribute to his many fine qualities. Let me mention just one of them: In the past decade and a half there have been times when, in the management and arrangement of our affairs here in the House, I have consulted with the Speaker on many matters where it might have been quite possible to have some little misunderstanding. On many occasions a slight misunderstanding, or a slight misinterpretation, of an agreement might have been used to partisan advantage. I want to say, and I know there are scores of others here who will join me in this, that in any matter involving the business of this House SAM RAYBURN's word is good, and a nod of his head is as good as his word. There has never been any misunderstanding, or any misinterpretation of any agreement I have had with him through the years, even though some of those agreements were quite informal, but involved complicated procedures. SAM RAYBURN is completely and thoroughly reliable. That is just one quality among many others that has caused him to hold this historic position longer than anyone in our history, and to continue to hold our affection and respect.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it has become a custom on January 6 of each year, and a very pleasant one it is, to sing the praises of the life and character of the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, and to wish him well in the days to come. The main characteristic of all these encomiums is that they come from the heart and everyone really means what he says. This is especially true this year when our beloved Speaker celebrates his 75th birthday, and may I say he doesn't look a day older than he did when I first came to Congress 14 years ago. Indeed, his keen mind is just as sharp as ever, his code of ethics is still outstanding, his warmth of friendship is just as strong, his sense of humor is even brighter, and his love of country remains as immovable and stanch as the Rock of Gibraltar. He was always a great man—today he is greater than ever.

Not many men have experienced such active and intimate service for their country, nor have lived in such exciting and changing times as has SAM RAYBURN. He has walked with the leaders of the world, he has advised them in critical times, but he has always maintained the common touch and the understanding heart which attract men to him. He honors us by his friendship. He has sponsored and aided in the passage of legislation which has affected the economy of mankind, and he has presided over the House of Representatives longer than any other Speaker in history. I

hope someone will write his biography so the world may know and realize what a great man he is and to learn to understand why we love and respect him.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you many happy returns of the day, and may God's rich blessings be showered upon you.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BREEDING].

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add my remarks of congratulations from the Sunflower State of Kansas. As a new Member, as an individual, and as a Representative of the people of Kansas, I wish Speaker RAYBURN many happy returns of the day and even longer service to the people of our great country.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS].

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii numbers among its citizens many who claim citizenship in Texas. I would be remiss if I did not extend on their behalf and on behalf of the people of Hawaii our fondest me ke aloha, and the desire that many more years of health be given to you so that you may continue to serve the people and provide the inspiration in fairness and justice that you have in the past. Aloha.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, as a new member of the North Carolina delegation, and on behalf of the new members of the North Carolina delegation, I should like to express our appreciation of the long and splendid service which has been rendered by our distinguished Speaker, SAM RAYBURN.

It was my privilege to meet Speaker RAYBURN in 1940 when he visited our community with the late Congressman A. L. Bulwinkle, who was my very dear friend. I know Mr. RAYBURN's many visits to North Carolina since that time have endeared him to the people of my State. The outstanding record of public service which he has established is sufficient laudation to him on this significant occasion.

However, I would like to say that I join with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, and the others who have spoken today, in wishing for our Speaker the success, the long life, and the happiness which will cause him to exceed even the record of the late Sir William Gladstone.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak the sentiments of the entire Republican delegation from Ohio when I join in this tribute that is being paid to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on his 75th birthday. While we on this side voted for our good friend and our leader on this side, Mr. MARTIN, for Speaker, I want you to know that the Republican delegation from Ohio not only respects but we love Speaker Sam.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Speaker RAYBURN is not only a great legislator

but he is also a philosopher and on this eve of his 50th anniversary as a legislator I should like to quote for the edification of all of us just one or two of his sayings which have become famous.

The first is: "Commonsense—that's just about all the sense there is."

Another one: "In politics if you cannot trust your instincts, you are not going anywhere."

Here is another one: "Damn the man who is always looking for credit. I have always noticed that if a man does his job, and does it well, he will get more credit than he is really entitled to."

Another one, and this is a very important one: "You never have to explain something you did not say."

Here is another one and the last one: "Life is a great romance—the greatest romance there is."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in reference to our great Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, may I join with all of your many friends in extending to you felicitations on the occasion of your 75th birthday. This is a memorable event and an important milestone in your long and fruitful life. As one of the most beloved men in public life today, you enjoy the affection and good will of every Member of the House irrespective of party. Your untiring service to the Congress and to the Nation should be an inspiration to the new Members of this body who are just beginning their legislative careers as it has been a source of strength and guidance to those of us who have been privileged to serve under your leadership in the past. Our wish for you is that you will have many more happy birthdays to come and that you will enjoy continued good health.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members of our Wisconsin delegation, I wish to convey our sincerest congratulations to our eminent Speaker upon his 75th birthday and the 50th anniversary of his legislative service to his community, his State, and to our Nation.

We have been fortunate, indeed, to have a man of your experience and wisdom leading and guiding us in these crucial years. You have devoted your energies and your many talents to unselfishly serving the public interest, and you have earned the respect and gratitude of the Nation.

In expressing our congratulations, I wish to voice my hope and prayers that the good Lord will bless you, Mr. Speaker, with many years of good health and happiness, and that, we in the House of Representatives and our entire Nation, may continue to have the benefit of your distinguished service and leadership for many years to come.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, may I also have the sincere pleasure and honor of saying for the distinguished Speaker, who sits in the Speaker's chair at this moment, that ever since I first came to this great legislative body a bit over 10

years ago now, his patriotic devotion, his fairmindedness, his equal justice in his rulings, and his consecrated purpose and service to our beloved country—these are some of the factors which have made my work in this House of Representatives most pleasant, most satisfying, and most inspiring. I join with each and all in most cordial felicitations on his birthday, on his anniversary of great legislative contribution to the legislative history of our Nation and to progress toward an enduring world peace. I am sure that I speak these extemporaneous words not only for myself but for those members of the California delegation who do not happen to be on the floor at this moment.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleague, Congressman COOPER, of Tennessee—the dean of our delegation—and my other colleagues in extending to Speaker RAYBURN my very best wishes on the occasion of his 75th birthday anniversary—may there be many such future celebrations.

As Congressman COOPER has indicated, we of Tennessee claim Speaker RAYBURN as one of our State's most distinguished sons. I feel compelled to repeat and to remind my colleagues that our Speaker is not only a native of Tennessee, but that he was born in Roane County which is located in the district immediately adjacent to the great district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

Speaker RAYBURN has many relatives in Tennessee—and a host of friends and admirers who are proud of his great achievements and attainments. I know they would want me to salute our Speaker and to extend to him best wishes on this his birthday anniversary.

Speaker RAYBURN's achievements in the Congress have been unexcelled. We are fortunate to be able to call him our friend and we wish for him many more years of happiness and usefulness.

THE HUNGARIAN SITUATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my main remarks this afternoon I would like to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying a well-deserved tribute to our beloved and distinguished Speaker upon the completion of these two memorable anniversaries.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of Congress, as well as millions of our fellow citizens, has been shocked and sickened in recent weeks by the events that have taken place in the little central European country of Hungary. Those tragic events had particular significance for me since I spent 2 years in the city of Budapest, from 1947 to 1949, watching the Communists progressively enslave the Hungarian people.

A brief review of the events of the critical period, October 23 to November 4, would, I think, be useful at this point. On October 23 student demonstrations broke out in Budapest and the demonstrators were fired on by the Communist police. Street fighting ensued and the

puppet Hungarian Government called for help from the Soviet occupation forces.

More Soviet troops entered the fighting the next day. The Hungarian Government appealed for the fighting to stop and announced surrender deadlines, which were ignored. Meanwhile fighting broke out in several large provincial cities.

As the revolt spread new elements were brought into the Hungarian Communist Government which broadcast promises of substantial reform, including negotiations for the withdrawal of Soviet troops in exchange for a cease-fire. Non-Communists were included in the Government for the first time on October 27.

On Sunday, October 28, the Government announced a cease-fire and the Prime Minister, Imre Nagy, stated that Soviet troops would withdraw from Budapest immediately. It was at this time that the local revolutionary committees and revolutionary workers' councils came to prominence with their demands, including Soviet military withdrawal from Hungary, free elections, and free speech, Hungarian neutrality, and many others.

A coalition government was formed on October 30, headed by Prime Minister Nagy. The next day he stated that Hungary was prepared to quit the Warsaw Pact and had asked for negotiations to get Soviet troops out of Hungary. It was at this time that Hungary's best-known anti-Communist, Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty, was liberated from his political prison and arrived in Budapest.

On November 1, Nagy formally announced that Hungary had withdrawn from the Warsaw Pact and proclaimed Hungarian neutrality. He also requested the United Nations to put the Hungarian question on its agenda. Meanwhile, Soviet troops were beginning to encircle Hungarian airfields and take key railways. This action was protested by the Hungarian Government on November 2 and the United Nations was notified of Soviet activities. The U. N. was also requested to appeal to the great powers to recognize Hungarian neutrality. Because of the importance of this appeal, I am going to read its text as broadcast by the Hungarian radio and monitored by the free Europe committee:

To Mr. DAG HAMMARSKJOLD,
Secretary General of the United Nations,
New York:

Your excellency, the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic wishes to bring the following supplementary information to the knowledge of your excellency:

I have already mentioned in my message of November 1 that new Soviet military formations had entered Hungary, that the Hungarian Government had informed the Soviet Ambassador about this, that it had repudiated the Warsaw Pact, that it had declared Hungary's neutrality and had turned to the United Nations to guarantee the neutrality. On November 2 the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic received new important information, army reports, according to which considerable Soviet military formations have crossed the country's frontier. They are advancing toward Budapest, occupying railway lines, railway stations, railway traffic installations and so forth on their way.

Reports have also been received about Soviet troop movements, in an east-west direction, in western Hungary.

In view of the above-mentioned facts the Hungarian Government deems it necessary to inform the Soviet Embassy in Budapest and the other diplomatic missions accredited to Budapest about the steps directed against our people's republic. The Hungarian Government has at the same time made concrete proposals to the Soviet Government concerning the withdrawal of Soviet troops stationed in Hungary, and the place for negotiations concerning implementation of the repudiation of the Warsaw Pact, and has also communicated the names of the Hungarian governmental delegation. In addition to this, the Hungarian Government has proposed to the Soviet Embassy in Budapest the setting up of a mixed committee to prepare the way for the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

I ask Your Excellency to call on the great powers to recognize Hungary's neutrality. The Security Council should instruct the Soviet and the Hungarian Governments to begin negotiations immediately. I ask Your Excellency to inform the members of the Security Council about the above facts and to accept the expression of my sincere esteem.

On Sunday, November 4, the blackest day in modern Hungarian history, Soviet forces attacked Budapest and other large cities of Hungary. The result was as expected, although fighting in Budapest continued until November 14 and partisan activity still is believed to be carried on. Typical of the appeals which went out from Hungarian transmitters is this one:

Civilized people of the world, listen and come to our aid, not with declarations, but with force, with soldiers and arms. Do not forget that there is no stopping the wild onslaught of bolshevism. Your turn will also come, once we perish. Save our souls! Save our souls!

Peoples of Europe whom we helped for centuries to withstand the barbaric attacks from Asia, listen to the tolling of Hungarian bells warning against disaster. * * * Civilized peoples of the world, we implore you to help us in the name of justice, of freedom, of the binding moral principles of active solidarity. Our ship is sinking. Light is failing, the shadows grow darker every hour over the soil of Hungary. Listen to the cry, civilized peoples of the world, and act; extend to us your fraternal hand.

SOS—SOS—may God be with you.

These bare, matter-of-fact developments which I have outlined form the skeleton of the Hungarian fight for freedom. Other noteworthy developments have, of course, subsequently taken place in Hungary, such as the protest strikes, sitdowns and slowdowns, the large-scale demonstrations by Hungarian womanhood, and other forms of passive protest. None of them, however, appear to have been successful in obtaining any major concessions from the Soviets or the Communist puppet regime of Janos Kadar. Not by terrorism, but by hunger and cold, the backbone of the Hungarian revolt appears to have been broken.

Having briefly sketched events in Hungary, Mr. Speaker, let us review the action on the part of this Government. Relief supplies of food, clothing, and medicines have been made available since the first days of fighting. While the frontier was open, these supplies were sent into Hungary through any

and all means available. Assistance is still going in via the International Red Cross and CARE, Inc. There has also been large-scale economic relief for the thousands of Hungarian refugees who entered Austria and the chances that the Congress will be asked to authorize further aid, both to the refugees and to the Austrian Government itself, are quite considerable.

I am sure that the Members are familiar with action which has been taken concerning the refugees themselves. I am equally sure that this subject will be thoroughly covered during the debate on our current immigration legislation and it is my purpose to touch on it now only briefly. I should like to point out, in the first place, that many other Western countries have taken similar and even greater action, comparably speaking, toward the admission and resettlement of roughly 150,000 refugees from Hungary that have entered Austria up to this time.

Last Tuesday Vice President Nixon submitted to the President his report of the Hungarian refugee problem. I shall not go into the details of this report but, in general, I should like to express my own approval of the ideas and recommendations contained therein.

There have, of course, been fears and concern expressed regarding the possible inclusion of Communist agents among the refugees. It is, admittedly, difficult to apply standard security checks to such large numbers of people in a very short space of time. But I believe that the Hungarian refugees themselves are relatively capable of determining whether or not there are spies and informers in their midst. Having sacrificed so much to make their escape to freedom, I know they will do all possible to warn of undesirable individuals among them. Actually, people have already been detected and returned to Hungary on legitimate grounds of suspicion. Further, I would not like to be in the shoes of any Communist spy among the refugees who was discovered by his compatriots. If you saw news pictures of the treatment of the secret police at the hands of the Budapest freedom fighters, you will understand what I mean.

There has also been concern expressed regarding the possible effect the admission of large numbers of refugees might have upon our own employment situation. I might in this connection state that the large labor unions themselves have been foremost in urging the admission of larger numbers. Personally, I believe that these people can and will be readily absorbed within our economy. I have so stated to many of my own constituents who have expressed some fears in this regard.

There is, however, one cause for concern which I have myself in this whole problem. The majority of the refugees were engaged in the Hungarian uprising—they formed the center and the core of anti-Communist resistance. They would certainly have been the leaders of future resistance or opposition to the Communist regime if they had remained behind. Now they have escaped in large numbers to Austria. Under the

operation of the refugee program, they are being scattered to the four corners of the globe, to Canada, to Australia, to South America, to this country and to many other far-removed places. Should not some thought be given to the possibility that by this dispersal we are harming the effectiveness of future anti-Communist resistance in Hungary? I offer this thought as worthy of some consideration by those persons in charge of our refugee program as well as those responsible for our overall foreign policy.

In this connection, it is not surprising that the Soviets and Hungarian Communists have allowed the frontier to remain relatively open and have permitted the exodus of large numbers of refugees. By so doing, they have been able to get rid of many anti-Communist Hungarians who otherwise would have to be deported or imprisoned.

I think that the House is likewise familiar with action which has been taken by the United Nations, to a very considerable extent as the result of the initiative of our own representatives there. Of particular note is the strong resolution of condemnation of Soviet military intervention which was passed by the General Assembly recently. Other resolutions of similar sense had been adopted earlier. The Secretary General of the U. N., Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, has tried repeatedly to visit Hungary in person or to send in a team of observers. These efforts have all come to naught due to the uncompromising attitude of refusal taken by the present Hungarian Government. Such attempts now appear to have been abandoned, at least for the time being.

I notice by the news ticker in the Speaker's lobby that Mr. Hammarskjöld admits they might as well give up trying to get United Nations observers or himself into Hungary, and that he intends to ask the Assembly for further extension of his authority, whatever that may mean. One idea that occurred to me when this came up was the possibility of getting together volunteers either as individuals or as units and seeing if we could get permission for these volunteers to get into Hungary. Then, on November 8, I received a telegram from the American-Hungarian Federation requesting me to wire the President and Ambassador Lodge, urging that the United States ask the United Nations to give permission for volunteers from America, Canada, Austria, South America, and so forth, to go into Hungary as nurses, aids, or volunteer soldiers if necessary. On the same day I sent the desired telegrams requesting our Government to ask the United Nations to permit international volunteers to enter Hungary in any capacity that will aid the Hungarian patriots. The White House replied on November 10 that this suggestion would receive very careful consideration and that I would have further advice very soon from the State Department.

Ambassador Lodge responded on November 15 and I quote the pertinent parts of his letter:

The United States is doing everything possible to speed United Nations action on this

vital matter. We are giving priority to the urgency of getting United Nations observers into Hungary and Secretary General Hammarskjöld is taking rapid steps to this end. The question of volunteers is one for the State Department to decide. * * *

The United States will continue to do everything in its power to keep faith with the Hungarian people. Their historic struggle has aroused the admiration of all free-men.

The State Department's reply was not forthcoming until December 7. Because of its importance, I quote it in full:

The tragedy which has occurred in Hungary has again exemplified the fierce desire for freedom on the part of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. The Department of State and the people of the United States are deeply concerned about this tragic situation; indeed, our first concern is for the physical safety and well-being of the Hungarian people. In quick response to their pleas, President Eisenhower made millions of dollars' worth of relief and medical supplies immediately available; and has made it possible for thousands of uprooted Hungarians to find refuge in America, should they so desire.

The United States does not believe that military action on the part of this country or of the free world would have been in the interests of the Hungarian people. Rather, such action would have almost surely led to the utter destruction of that valiant country and opened up the possibility of a conflict engulfing the entire world.

The United States Government cannot approve the participation of American volunteers for the following considerations:

1. Section 349 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 provides that American citizens shall lose their citizenship by entering or serving in the armed forces of a foreign State unless, prior to such entry or service, the entry or service is specifically authorized in writing by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. Such authorization for service in Hungary has not been granted in any individual case and there is no intention of departing from this policy.

2. American volunteers could not travel to Hungary without violating the neutrality of Austria and would undoubtedly be prevented from such a course by that Government.

3. In the light of the foregoing, American passports cannot now be validated for travel in Hungary.

4. We believe that the best opportunity for helping the Hungarian people at the present time is through our support of the efforts that are being made in the United Nations. These efforts would be seriously jeopardized if American volunteers were to proceed to Hungary.

Ambassador Lodge has taken a forceful lead in the United Nations and was instrumental in obtaining a majority for support of a resolution aimed not only at ending Soviet intervention and armed attack in Hungary, but also at upholding the right of the Hungarian people to freedom and justice.

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles are giving their continued urgent attention to the courageous efforts of the Hungarian people. Certainly it is the hope of all America that they achieve their aims of greater liberty, national independence, and the withdrawal of foreign troops.

I would like to make a few comments on this letter setting forth to a considerable degree the official policy of our Government at the time of the Hungarian uprising. First, you will note that the State Department entirely ruled out the use of military force, either on our part or even as part of an international police force. I take it then, that had

a U. N. police force been in existence at the time, this Government would have opposed its use on the grounds that further destruction of and loss of life in Hungary would have been the result and the prospects for world war III would have been considerably enhanced. In other words, we opposed any military help of any kind being sent to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters.

The fact that American volunteers would have run the risk of expatriation if they had somehow been able to join the Freedom Fighters is, of course, a fact under our present nationality legislation. Whether this should be changed or not is, of course, for the Congress to decide. I can only express my gratitude that, during the days of our own American Revolution, no such legislation was operative to prevent the many foreign patriots (including Hungarians) who came to our shores to assist us in our own struggle for liberty and independence. It is truly fortunate that the help we received at that time from France and other countries was not confined to relief packages and resolutions condemning King George III.

Regarding the question of Austrian neutrality and the consequences that might ensue from its violation, that, of course, is a delicate problem. I understand that this fear operates to rule out many forms of assistance to Hungary that have been suggested, such as a food-lift by U. N. planes, the employment of balloons to carry in relief packages, in short, any departure from channels of relief work which have been permitted by the Communists. It would, naturally, be operable against any form of military assistance to the Hungarians, whether volunteers, military supplies, or anything else.

From reliable sources, I have learned that there has been considerable concern recently lest Soviet military forces might invade Austria. Now, under the terms of the Austrian peace treaty, the neutrality of that country is guaranteed by this Government as well as the Soviet Union. If Austria were invaded by Soviet troops, I cannot pretend to say what the reaction of this Government would be. I would suggest, however, that Austria would certainly be deserving of our protection as many of the Middle Eastern countries covered by the resolution presented to the Congress 2 days ago.

I do not necessarily take objection to the State Department's belief that we could best help Hungary through the United Nations. The government set up by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters themselves evidently thought so. There were no appeals direct to this Government from the Nagy regime at the time of the Soviet attack—they were all directed to the United Nations. What is reasonably certain is that, to this time, U. N. action has certainly not produced the hoped-for results.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many, many suggestions as to what could have been done and what might still be done to aid the embattled Hungarian patriots. There have been suggestions of economic, diplomatic, and political sanctions against the Soviet Union by all free nations. There have been sugges-

tions for the severance of diplomatic relations with the puppet Hungarian government and the expulsion of that government from membership in the United Nations. Similar suggestions have even been made regarding the Soviet Union itself. There have been suggestions to fly the U. N. Secretary-General or his appointed observers into Hungary without the permission of the Soviets or the Hungarian Communists, even though this would technically be a violation of the U. N. Charter. Another suggestion was to appoint U. N. observers from the staffs of Western diplomatic missions accredited to Budapest. Other suggestions, made while there was still widespread fighting, involved the immediate dispatch of military supplies to the Hungarian anti-Communists by any and all means available. I have already referred to the suggestion of a U. N. airlift of relief supplies to be dropped by parachute.

Leaders of the American-Hungarian Society with whom I recently discussed these matters laid particular emphasis on the urgency of getting large amounts of relief supplies into Hungary by any and all means available. They explained that Red Cross supplies are being shipped from Vienna direct to Budapest and CARE parcels direct from Belgrade to Budapest with the result that the Hungarian countryside is completely bypassed. Since the need in Budapest alone greatly exceeds the available supply, the chances are that several months will pass before the provincial cities receive their share of aid. It was suggested, therefore, that all other forms of relief supplies be sent across the Hungarian border wherever there might be an opening. The proposal of using balloons to get substantial amounts of food and medicine into Hungary was also suggested. Other proposals from these sources included the formation of a government in exile and permitting young Hungarian escapees to volunteer in NATO army units.

The Hungarian National Council recommended the establishment of a central register to keep track of all Hungarian Freedom Fighters who escaped. It suggested the use of appropriate economic assistance to the Hungarian people themselves and exploration of the possibility for private relief packages to be sent from this country to Hungary. A United States Government loan to the council itself was suggested to enable that organization to expand its activities. Economic sanctions against the Soviet Union were suggested and strong hope was expressed that the Congress would continue to keep the whole Hungarian question in the forefront of its attention.

All of these suggestions have varying merits and all deserve consideration by our Government and other governments of the free world. As far as the American people themselves are concerned, I think our feelings were best expressed in an editorial which appeared in the November 5 issue of the New York Times entitled "We Accuse." Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert it in my remarks at this point.

WE ACCUSE

We accuse the Soviet Government of murder. We accuse it of the foulest treachery and the basest deceit known to man. We accuse it of having committed so monstrous a crime against the Hungarian people yesterday that its infamy can never be forgiven or forgotten.

Lenin wrote in 1900: "The Czarist Government not only keeps our people in slavery but sends it to suppress other peoples rising against their slavery (as was done in 1849 when Russian troops put down the revolution in Hungary)." How apt these words sound today when we substitute "Soviet" for "Czarist," and 1956 for 1849.

Hatred and pity, mourning and admiration, these are our emotions today: hatred for the men and the system which did not hesitate to shed new rivers of innocent Hungarian blood to reimpose slavery; pity for the Soviet soldiers, duped into thinking they were fighting Fascists when they killed defenseless or nearly defenseless men, women, and children; mourning and admiration for the heroic Hungarian people who feared not even death to strike for freedom.

Gone now are the last illusions. Moscow now stands self-exposed. The torrent of Soviet bullets yesterday did not kill only Hungary's freedom and Hungary's martyrs. Those bullets killed first of all the picture of a reformed, penitent Russia seeking to repudiate Stalinism and practice coexistence. Could Stalin have acted more barbarously than did his successors yesterday? Can we have any doubt now of what awaits us if we ever relax our vigilance and permit ourselves to become prey to Soviet might, as was Hungary yesterday?

The day of infamy is ended. The foul deed is done. The most heroic are dead. But the cause of freedom lives and is stronger than ever, nurtured by the blood of those who fell martyred in freedom's cause. The Hungarian people will never forget. We shall not forget. And out of hatred and tears is born the resolve to carry forward the struggle till freedom is triumphant.

Both in respect to responding to appeals for relief and in opening our doors to thousands of homeless refugees, the American people and the American Government have done a great deal and are prepared to do more. But I have a feeling that our people are unhappy and concerned that more concrete, more positive assistance was not forthcoming. I have not talked with anyone in a private capacity who is satisfied that we have done all we can.

The other day I read a rather remarkable article in the December 29 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "The Man Who Wanted to Help Hungary." It tells the story of Mr. John Richardson, a young associate of a New York banking house, who became stirred by the Hungarian fight for freedom and who was personally instrumental in securing substantial contributions of drugs, food, and money for the Hungarian relief. According to the article, Mr. Richardson was finally afforded the opportunity of purchasing supplies of weapons and sending them to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. On the advice of the State Department, however, he abandoned this idea. I would now like to quote the concluding paragraphs of this article, written by Mr. Harold H. Martin:

He still is not convinced that he was right when he gave up trying to find weapons and send them into Hungary. To him, the Hungarians, in their week of bloody agony before

the tanks rolled over them, were not fighting for one form of communism as opposed to another. They were fighting for liberty, for the things that free men everywhere believe in and will die for. And he feels that he, and all the free world, let them down. If the Hungarians could have held out just a little longer, he believes that the restive, conquered nations of all the satellite countries might have flared into revolt. In east Germany, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Poland, brave and angry men inspired by Hungary's fight might have risen to strike down the iron curtain behind which they have lived in slavery for a decade.

If this flame of rebellion that flared so suddenly in Hungary could have been fanned, he feels—if the fire of revolt could have been spread by our help, official or unofficial—it might have finally reached the Kremlin. It might have meant the end of the Soviet tyranny, the finish for Mr. Molotov, and Mr. Khrushchev, and Mr. Bulganin, and all that crew of grim or smiling murderers who dream of a Communist empire that will dominate the world. It might have been the end of them and the beginning of the peace that men have prayed for through years of fear and frustration and cold war.

It was a turning point in history, he feels, when the first homemade Hungarian bomb exploded under a Soviet tank. Then, for just a moment, the door of freedom opened. But a cold voice spoke in the U. N., and the door slammed shut, and Hungary felt the clasp of Communist chains again while the anger and compassion of the free world dissolved in talk.

And this is why John Richardson today feels little pride in what he did to help, and is embarrassed and a little angry when you speak to him about it. Maybe he did do all that one man could do, he says. And maybe this country's Government and the United Nations did all that they could do. But it all boiled down to the things that are easy to give—to money, and medicine, and food, and sympathetic words, and a haven of peace for a few thousand homeless refugees. And that was not enough.

Mr. Speaker, it is a subject for legitimate debate, I believe, as to what our Government should or should not have done during the Hungarian crisis. Personally, I believe we should have done more, much more. I believe that as a result of our inability or our inaction or both, our so-called policy of liberation has to all intents and purposes gone down the drain. The peoples of any other satellite country know now that we are, or at least allege to be, nearly powerless to really assist them in their efforts to throw off their chains. If, by their own efforts, they should succeed in gaining partial independence, we will probably assist them from an economic point of view. But, so far as helping them when they need it the most, we either can, or will, do little or nothing.

But if the question of blame for this country's lack of action is debatable, surely the weak, pusillanimous, and vacillating attitude of the United Nations in this affair is deservedly subject to strong criticism. By its failure to go beyond words, beyond resolutions in this instance, the U. N. has shown its true impotency in a real crisis.

There is no question as to its responsibility—the Nagy government had appealed directly for U. N. assistance. But, as compared to the Suez matter, the U. N. has rather clearly shown that it is willing to abide by a double standard of

international law—one code for civilized aggressors, such as Britain and France, and one code for international barbarians and gangsters, such as the Soviets have proven themselves to be. No real attempt was made to get U. N. observers into Hungary, in spite of the mandate of the General Assembly, and now all pretense has been dropped by the disbanding of the three-man commission. As I said, Mr. Speaker, today's Bulletin carries the story from New York. Now Dag Hammarskjöld has admitted his complete inability to get U. N. observers in and has asked the General Assembly for a further extension of the orders.

Now I ask, what faith can the Hungarian people or any other Communist-controlled people now have in U. N. promises and pledges, what hope can they have in resolutions?

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Can the gentleman from Michigan tell me if this statement is true: Is it true that the representatives of Hungary, representatives of the Kadar government, have been invited by the Inaugural Committee here in Washington, to the inauguration and to the inaugural ball, and the festivities pertaining thereto?

Mr. BENTLEY. The gentleman's information on that is better than mine. I have not heard anything about it. I, of course, would regard it as atrocious if such an invitation had been issued, and certainly I hope none has. Certainly for such an invitation to be issued to the representatives of the puppet Hungarian government would be the last straw.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to tell the gentleman that I very much appreciate the vast amount of research he has done on this subject which is a very vital matter and is something that is in order, as far as I personally am concerned, for debate in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel the Members of this House owe the gentleman from Michigan a vote of thanks for the thorough manner in which he has analyzed some of the most important aspects of the Hungarian freedom revolution. It is a well-known fact that Mr. BENTLEY is an outstanding American authority on the Hungarian nation. His broad knowledge concerning the conspiracy of communism makes him eminently qualified to perform the public service which he has so well done today.

I note that the Department of State, in rejecting the idea of American volunteers to aid the Hungarian patriots, ad-

vanced as one of its reasons that American volunteers could not get into Hungary without going through Austria and that to do so would violate the neutrality of Austria. I should like to draw attention of the Members of this House to an oversight on the part of the Department of State. If President Eisenhower's policy evaluation of Yugoslavia under date of October 15, 1956, which was made known to Congress only a few days ago, is valid, then American volunteers could have gone through Yugoslavia without violating anyone's neutrality. President Eisenhower has stated that Yugoslavia is not connected with the international Communist conspiracy and that Tito is prepared to assist all nations fighting for their freedom and independence—that being according to the President, the policy of Tito's regime. It is important—and I hope the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee will ask the Department of State why they consider Austria as the only means of entry into Communist-occupied Hungary.

The answer is apparent to anyone who has studied the situation. Here the Department of State, without equivocation, admits that the billion dollars of United States taxpayers money spent on Tito has been wasted and also that the President's policy evaluation of October 15, 1956, with respect to Tito, is invalid. Tito, by turning back to the Russians hundreds of the enemies of communism, including defectors from the Red Army, has provided additional proof that his first loyalty is to Moscow and that he holds nothing but contempt for the basic freedoms.

Mr. BENTLEY. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Ohio, my good friend, who has dedicated himself to the cause of freedom in the captive countries, that among other things, Tito has turned back some 150 Hungarians across the border into Yugoslavia.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. BENTLEY. They have been turned back to the Communists.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is my understanding.

I commend the gentleman for expressing the hope that Congress would help to keep the Hungarian revolution in the forefront of world attention. It is quite apparent that the Russians are attempting to divert world attention from the massacre of Hungarians by causing new trouble elsewhere in the world and that we are likely to aid and abet this Russian maneuver if we emphasize only the problems of the Middle East without keeping them in the focus of the Hungarian fight for freedom. I feel certain that the gentleman from Michigan who was 1 of 7 who introduced identical resolutions to create a select committee to investigate the latest acts of Communist aggression in Hungary, will help keep the story of the Hungarian fight for freedom before the people of the world. I also commend the gentleman for his excellent analysis of the political paralysis which now grips the United Nations and prevents enforcement of a resolution passed December 12, 1956, by the General Assembly condemning this Russian aggression against Hungary and calling for the

Red Army to get out of Hungary. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he would agree with me that it is time the United Nations either called upon the Russians to abide by the charter of the United Nations or be expelled from that body.

Mr. BENTLEY. I certainly would agree with the gentleman. It is high time. This is not the first example of Charter violation on the part of the Soviets, and I have long advocated that the United Nations take some action against them. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate his contribution very much.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I want to commend the gentleman for making the very interesting statement which he has made. I think his summary of the facts is most important and most apposite. On Saturday last I placed in the RECORD some data of the International Commission of Jurists from The Hague. I have in my hands here today another statement of theirs dated December 7. It is very interesting on the strictly legal aspects of the matter, and I ask unanimous consent that this matter be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE HUNGARIAN SITUATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS OF 1949

The reports from Hungary about mass arrests, summary trial,¹ deportations,² and other measures which are alleged to have infringed the rule of law have attracted worldwide attention.

The present Government of Hungary contends that the national uprising suppressed by Soviet armed forces is an internal affair of Hungary. The Soviet Union holds the same view.

It is, however, to be remembered that there are rules of international law which apply even if the conflict in question is merely a "civil war." These rules are laid down in the Geneva Conventions for the protection of the victims of war,³ concluded in 1949 and

¹ Cf. Decree on criminal procedure of November 10, 1956 (Radio Budapest, November 10, 1956, 14.00 hours, as monitored in BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, pt. II B, No. 777/1956/, pp. 8-9 with text of decree).

² Cf. Report of Radio Budapest, November 14, 1956, 15.00 hours (BBC, The Monitoring Report, No. 5, 200 /November 15, 1956/, p. 1) as well as the case of Imre Nagy and his group. According to several testimonials of Hungarian refugee camps of deportees exist in Soviet Carpatho-Ukraine.

³ Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (hereafter called "Convention I").

Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick, and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea (hereafter called "Convention II").

Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (hereafter called "Convention III").

Convention for the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (hereafter called "Convention IV").

ratified among others by the Soviet Union⁴ and by the Hungarian People's Republic.⁵

The obligations entered into by the signatories of the convention depend on the character of the conflict, and are more specific if it is an international conflict and less detailed if it is an internal one.

I. OBLIGATIONS IN AN INTERNAL CONFLICT

If it is assumed that the conflict is an internal one, the parties are bound to apply among others the following provisions at least:

Persons taking no active part in the hostilities shall be treated humanely. The following acts in particular are prohibited:

"(a) Violence to life and person, in particular murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture.

"(b) Taking of hostages.

"(c) Outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment.

"(d) The passing of sentence and the carrying out of executions without previous judgment pronounced by a regularly constituted court, affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognized as indispensable by civilized peoples" (art. 3, convention IV).

During the negotiations the Soviet Union supported a draft approved by the XVIIth International Red Cross Conference at Stockholm in August 1948⁶ which served as a basis for discussion at the Diplomatic Conference in Geneva in 1949. This text reads:

"In all cases of armed conflict not of an international character * * * the parties to the conflict shall be bound to implement the provisions of the present convention [i. e., as a whole, not only art. 3 mentioned above], subject to the adverse party likewise acting in obedience thereto."

When this text met with opposition on the part of a number of Government delegates, the Soviet Union introduced the following version of the provision:

"The parties to the conflict shall be bound to implement the provisions of the present convention which guarantee:

"Humane treatment of the civilian population.

"Prohibition within the territory occupied * * * of reprisals against the civilian population, the taking of hostages, * * * damage to property.

"Prohibition of any discriminatory treatment of the civilian population."⁷

The delegate from Hungary also favored as wide as possible an application of the convention to civil wars:

"The essential aim of the conference was to extend the field of action of the convention as much as possible for the protection of the victims of conflicts."⁸

⁴ The Belorussian and Ukrainian republics are also signatories of the Conventions.

⁵ English text: Final Record of the Diplomatic Conference of Geneva of 1949, Berne (hereafter cited Record), vol. I; French text: Actes de la Conférence diplomatique de Genève de 1949, Berne, tome I; Russian text: Zhenevskie konventsi o zashchite zhertv voyny, Izdanie Vedomostel Verhovnogo Soveta SSSR (publication of Gazette of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R.), Moscow, 1954, 219 pp.; German text: Bundesgesetzblatt, Bonn, teil II, S. 781 ff; Die Genfer Abkommen zum Schutz der Kriegesopfer vom 12. August 1949, hrsg. vom Deutschen Roten Kreuz, 2. Aufl., Bonn 1953.

⁶ Cf. Record, vol. IIB, pp. 13-14, 34, 37, 42, 44, 47, 76, 93, 325-327.

⁷ Art. 2, par. 4 of the draft. Text: Record, vol. I, p. 113.

⁸ Amendment of the Soviet Union, July 21, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex no. 15, p. 28). Corresponding amendments for the other conventions.

⁹ Joint committee, first meeting, Apr. 26, 1949. (Record, vol. IIB, p. 11).

II. INTERNAL OR INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT?

The view that events in Hungary represent merely an internal conflict has no basis in international or Hungarian law. It is the considered view of the International Commission of Jurists that the events in Hungary amount to an international conflict with two adverse parties—the Hungarian nation on the one side and the Soviet Union on the other side. The reasons for this view are as follows:

1. The suppression of the national uprising in Hungary constitutes an aggression in the sense of the Soviet definition of aggression proposed to the United Nations in 1953 (cf. the paper Hungary and the Soviet Definition of Aggression, released by the International Commission of Jurists, November 16, 1956).

2. The overthrow of the Nagy government and the setting up of the Kadar regime was effected with the help of Soviet armed forces and constitute an indirect aggression in the sense of the definition just mentioned.

3. The request for military assistance made by the Kadar government was therefore not valid under international law.

4. The request was also invalid in Hungarian constitutional law. The armed attack began before the Kadar regime was in power. Five days later—on November 9—a constitutional amendment was enacted to legalize subsequently the existence and the acts of the Kadar government.¹⁰

5. The request, even if validly made, could have had no legal effect on the application of the convention, since article 47 of convention IV stipulates:

"Protected persons * * * shall not be deprived, in any case or in any manner whatsoever, of the benefits of the present convention * * * by any agreement between the authorities of the occupied territories and the occupying power * * *."

The Soviet and Hungarian Governments are therefore under a legal duty to carry out those obligations which the Geneva conventions provide for cases of an international conflict.

III. OBLIGATIONS IN AN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT

The obligations apply to all cases of armed conflict between two or more of the parties as well as "to all cases of partial or total occupation of the territory of a high contracting party, even if the said occupation meets with no armed resistance" (art. 2/2/2/2).¹¹

The obligations of the signatory states in such cases include among others:

A. With respect to all victims of war

The provisions mentioned under this heading "cover the whole of the populations of the countries in conflict, without any adverse distinction based in particular on political opinion, and are intended to alleviate the sufferings caused by the war" (art. 13).¹²

1. Particular protection of the wounded and children (arts. 16-22, 24).

2. Allowing free passage of all consignments of medical and hospital stores and, if intended for children and mothers, also of essential foodstuffs, clothing, and tonics (art. 23).¹³

3. Allowing family correspondence and facilitating inquiries made by members of dispersed families (arts. 25, 26).

B. With respect to civilian persons

The provisions mentioned under this heading cover all persons who are nationals of a

¹⁰ Decree of November 10, 1956. Text broadcast by Radio Budapest, November 9, 1956, 7 p. m. (BBC summary, pt. IIB, No. 777 (1956), p. 7).

¹¹ Article common to all four conventions. ¹² This and the following article refer to convention IV.

¹³ Cf. text proposed by the Soviet Union (Record, vol. III, annex No. 222, p. 114).

state bound by the convention and find themselves in the hands of an occupying power of which they are not nationals. The protection extends to all persons who are not covered by one of the other three conventions (see note 3) (art. 4). The protection lasts for the duration of the occupation (art. 6). If a protected person is suspected or engaged in activities hostile to the security of the occupying power he forfeits certain rights under convention IV, but retains at least the right of fair and regular trial (cf. infra under 10) (art. 5).

4. Human treatment, respect for the person, honor, family rights, religious convictions, customs. Equal treatment, "without any adverse distinction based, in particular, on political opinion" (art. 27).

5. No exercise of physical or moral coercion (art. 31). Prohibition of any measures causing physical suffering or extermination of protected persons, including, e. g., torture, or any other measure of brutality (art. 32).¹⁴

6. Prohibition of collective penalties and all measures of intimidation or terrorism (art. 33).¹⁵ Prohibition of taking hostages (art. 34).

7. Prohibition of "individual or mass forcible transfers,"¹⁶ as well as deportations of protected persons from occupied territory to the territory of the occupying power or to that of any other country, occupied or not, regardless of their motive" (art. 49, cf. also arts. 52, 76-77).

The phrase "into the territory of the Occupying Power or the territory of any other country" was incorporated on the suggestion of the Soviet Union.¹⁷

8. No sanctions or any measures of coercion against public officials or judges, should they abstain from fulfilling their functions for reasons of conscience (art. 54).

9. Duty to ensure food and medical supplies to the population (art. 55)¹⁸ as well as hospital establishments and services (art. 56). Duty to allow and facilitate relief schemes for the population if inadequately supplied (art. 59-62). Red Cross Societies shall be able to pursue their activities (art. 63).¹⁹

10. Respect for existing criminal legislation (art. 64). Duty not to enact retroactive criminal laws (art. 65). Courts of the Occupying Power shall apply only those provisions of law which are in accordance with general principles of law (art. 67). The penalty shall be in proportion to the offense (art. 67-68). There shall be no prosecution for acts committed or for opinions expressed before the occupation (art. 70). No sentence shall be pronounced by the competent courts of the Occupying Power except after a regular trial (art. 71). An accused person shall have the right of defense (art. 72) and a convicted person the right of appeal (art. 73). They shall be detained and serve their sentences in the occupied territory (art. 76).

C. With respect to prisoners of war

The convention also protects apart from the traditional category of "members of the

¹⁴ Cf. Amendment of the Soviet Union, June 14, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 231, p. 116), supported by Hungary in the 13th meeting of committee III, June 15, 1949 (Record, vol. IIA, p. 717).

¹⁵ Cf. Text presented by the Soviet Union, June 7, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 234, p. 117).

¹⁶ The words "individual or mass" are missing from the Russian text, as reproduced in the source quoted supra, note 5. The English and French texts are, however, authentic (art. 55/54/133/150).

¹⁷ Amendment of the Soviet Union, May 12, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 45, p. 130).

¹⁸ Cf. Amendment of the Soviet Union, June 28, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 282, p. 136).

¹⁹ Cf. Amendment of the Soviet Union, June 28, 1949, (Record, vol. III, annex No. 292, p. 139).

armed forces of a party" the following persons among others:

(a) Members of organized resistance movements, if they are commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates, if they carry arms openly and respect the laws and customs of war.

(b) Members of regular armed forces who profess allegiance to a government or an authority not recognized by the detaining power.

(c) Inhabitants who on the approach of the enemy spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading forces, if they carry arms openly and respect the laws and custom of war (art. 4 A).²⁰

The convention applies to these persons from the time they fall into the power of the enemy until their final release (art. 5).

The inclusion of the persons mentioned under a-c was considered imperative considering the experience of Nazi occupation of Denmark and other countries which were invaded without resistance on the part of the armed forces. The innovation was supported by the Soviet delegate who declared: "Citizens who took up arms in defense of the liberty of their country should be entitled to the same protection as members of armed forces."²¹

He spoke also in favor of protection of members of resistance movements (partisans).²² The Hungarian delegate supported the Soviet Union in both cases.²³

The individual obligations of the detaining power include among others:

11. Duty to treat prisoners of war humanely (art. 13).²⁴

Respect for their person and honor (art. 14). Equal treatment "without any adverse distinction based on political opinions" (art. 16).

12. Duty to allow prisoners of war to send and receive letters and cards (art. 71).

13. Duty not to bring a prisoner of war before a court unless it offers the essential guaranty of independence and impartiality as generally recognized and in particular, a procedure which affords the accused the rights of defense (arts. 84, 105) and of appeal (art. 106).

14. No prisoner of war may be tried or sentenced for an act which is not forbidden by the law of the detaining power or by international law, in force at the time the said act was committed. No moral or physical coercion may be exerted on a prisoner of war in order to induce him to admit his guilt. No prisoner of war may be convicted without having had an opportunity to present his defense and the assistance of a qualified advocate or counsel (art. 99).

15. Prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities (art. 118).

D. Provisions for enforcing these obligations

The following provisions are incorporated into all four Geneva Conventions in order to assure their strict performance.

1. The parties undertake to respect and to insure respect for the present convention in all circumstances (art. 1/1/1/1).²⁵

2. The protected persons may in no circumstances renounce in part or in entirety the rights secured to them by the present convention (art. 7/7/7/8).

3. The convention shall be applied with the cooperation and under the scrutiny of the protecting powers (art. 8/8/8/9). The

parties may agree to entrust to an impartial organization the duties incumbent on the protecting powers (art. 10/10/10/11).²⁶

4. The parties undertake to enact any legislation necessary to provide effective penal sanctions for persons committing or ordering to be committed, any grave breaches of the conventions (art. 49/50/129/146 and art. 50/51/130/147).²⁷

The Hungarian delegate stated that the Hungarian military penal code, in force since February 1, 1949, stipulates severe penalties for violations of the convention.²⁸

5. An inquiry shall be instituted concerning any alleged violation of the convention (art. 52/53/132/149).

IV

In publishing this paper the International Commission of Jurists hopes to act in the interests of the signatories of the Geneva Conventions, including the Soviet Union and Hungary, since articles 47/48/127/144 of the conventions provide:

"The high contracting parties undertake * * * to disseminate the text of the present convention as widely as possible in their respective countries, * * * so that the principles thereof may become known to the entire population."

December 7, 1956, International Commission of Jurists, Buitenhof 47, The Hague.

Mr. HALE. I hope very much that we shall succeed in keeping this whole matter in the forefront of public attention in such a way that this country can act as effectively as may be for these oppressed people.

Mr. BENTLEY. I might say to the gentleman from Maine I was very interested in reading the article which he inserted in the Appendix of the daily Record last Saturday.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Michigan for the great contribution he is making on an important matter about which so little is known. It is particularly important for the American people, and all the people for that matter, to remember that there were two phases of this upheaval that occurred in Hungary: First, when the Hungarians overthrew the Communist Hungarian Government and, second, when Russia invaded Hungary. The fact that the gentleman has so well pointed out the phases of this matter is certainly a great contribution.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. I certainly hope that someday in the near future he will give the Congress the benefit of his observations and experiences while he was recently on the Austrian border so close to Hungary. I am sure the House would be interested in hearing it.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

²⁰ This and the following articles refer to convention III.

²¹ Committee II, fifth meeting, May 16, 1949 (Record, vol. II, A, p. 426).

²² Loc. cit., p. 429.

²³ Source as in notes 21 and 22.

²⁴ Cf. Amendment of the Soviet Union, May 4, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 99, p. 64).

²⁵ This and the following articles are common to all four conventions.

²⁶ Cf. an amendment by the Soviet Union, July 20, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex 26, p. 34) and the reservation of the Soviet Union and Hungary to art. 10/10/10/11.

²⁷ Cf. Amendments of the Soviet Union of July 20 and 21, 1949 (Record, vol. III, annex No. 53 and 53 A, pp. 44).

²⁸ Record, vol. II B, p. 32.

Mr. HILLINGS. I join with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan in raising this discussion today. I think it would be well to point out that he has been one of those who for many years has maintained, contrary to the belief of some persons in high places in Government, that it would be possible for the people behind the Iron Curtain to throw off the yoke of Communist slavery. There were those, such as Mr. George Kennan and others who held high positions in the Department of State who have consistently maintained that we might as well recognize the fact that certain areas of the world belonged to the Communists. The gentleman from Michigan and others have maintained the reverse; that it was still possible behind the Iron Curtain to be free and be independent.

Is it not true that the significant point in the Hungarian revolution is the fact that it was led by two categories of people which were supposedly completely indoctrinated by the Communists? No. 1, the young people and, No. 2, the workers. They led the revolution. It was said that they could do nothing about the situation, but, the Hungarians have shown the whole world that young people and workers in Communist areas, despite many years of indoctrination, are not necessarily convinced. Is it not true also that we should keep the lesson of Hungary in mind when we talk about China and when we talk about many other countries, because the same thing that happened in Hungary could happen elsewhere. I might add the hope that the gentleman's remarks and the remarks of my colleagues here today will be listened to and read by some of the leaders in our Government and will help to make our foreign policy, because if the day ever comes when our leaders in Government say that we should write off certain areas to the Communists, we will be making one of the most tragic mistakes in history.

Mr. BENTLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I thank him very much.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time that we started to face facts. The moral strength of the free world is a powerful force when used against a government which is responsive to the will of its own people. But when it is faced with a government completely devoid of all standards of international morality, a government which cares little or nothing for popular feeling, a government such as the Soviet Union, it is a very different matter indeed. If the U. N. is to survive in this world as a force for international peace and justice, it is going to have to learn to deal with aggressors to whom nothing is sacred and who are deaf to resolutions and expressions, however genuinely uttered. The Soviets do not acknowledge the will of the majority in their own country, why should we expect them to acknowledge it within our international forum.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that there is little in the way of concrete, positive action that we as a Nation can take at this time in honor of the brave and courageous people of Hungary, either within or without the United Nations. But cer-

tainly we can all unite in paying tribute to these brave men, women, and children of Hungary who showed the world not only an example of the highest form of courage but also that there are still things in this world worth fighting and dying for. Surfeited with 11 years of tyranny and oppression, they rose up against their masters and, while the world waited breathlessly, seemed miraculously to have won for a few short days. Then the black shadow of totalitarian despotism again set in. They believed in the prospects of help from the free world, from the major western powers, from the U. N. itself. They were justified in their belief, for were they not fighting the battles of the free world, were they not defending the cause of liberty and independence against tyranny and slavery? And is that not our own cause and the cause of free men and free nations everywhere? Bitter must have been their realization and boundless must have been their despair when they finally learned that there was to be no help, no hope, and they had been left to wage a hopelessly unequal battle alone.

Some will say that this was merely another milestone on the road to liberation by peaceful means. Others will say and have said that any further intervention on our part would have risked world war III, that it would only have brought further bloodshed, misery, suffering, and destruction to unhappy Hungary. No one now can tell what would have happened if we had acted differently. The only thing that can be said with certainty is that a brave little people rose up and fought for their freedom against the mightiest tyrant of modern times, a brave little people who asked the free world for help to enable them to carry on their own fight. A brave little people who failed to receive that help and who were mercilessly drowned in a sea of their own blood. That much is history.

The very day of the Soviet invasion, Sunday, November 4, I had the honor to address a large joint Hungarian-Polish rally in the city of Detroit, even as early reports of the Communist treachery and massacre were being received. At that time I said that we were standing at the crossroads and that if this opportunity were missed, we might not have another. I said at that time that our action in the next few days might determine not only our own fate but the fate of the entire free world for years to come.

Maybe I was wrong. Maybe a final opportunity has not been missed. Maybe a divine providence will still grant us another opportunity as a people to prove our own devotion to the cause of freedom and justice for all men in all parts of the world. Maybe this Congress can win immortal glory for itself by taking action that will bring freedom to those who so richly deserve it. Our Government appears to be at a loss to know what to do next, it feels that any further assistance would run the risk of another world war. May be it is up to us as representatives of the American people to resolve on and adopt a course of action that will rekindle a flame of hope

in the hearts of those who have now lost all hope.

In conclusion, I would like to say this. I am still firmly convinced that one day the Hungarian people will be free along with the other enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Their sufferings and sacrifices of recent weeks has revealed a great victory for the cause of freedom everywhere throughout the world. It has shown the Soviets that not only the satellite troops but even, in some instances, their own soldiers, are hardly to be trusted for the purposes of military aggression. It has shown the internal weaknesses of the Soviet Government more clearly than any other single event of the last decade. It has shown that the spirit of freedom cannot be crushed among those who have once enjoyed it, it has clearly demonstrated that even half a generation of intensive Sovietization was insufficient to win the allegiance of young people who had never known anything else. But these victories must be exploited and not accepted passively by the leaders of the free world and especially of our own Government.

I say that recent events have strengthened my conviction that Hungary will again be free along with the other Moscow-dominated peoples. But it still remains for us as leaders of the free world to do even more than we have already done to help keep this spark of freedom alive. I would not wish to see this Government or the United Nations render any form of assistance that would strengthen the control of the present Communist puppet regime in Hungary, or elsewhere. If assistance is to be forthcoming there must be no doubt in the minds of everyone that it is received by the Hungarian people themselves.

The Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has assured the Soviet Government on many occasions that we only want to see the Eastern European countries in the hands of governments which are friendly to the Soviet Union, that we have no thought of using those countries as bases for military action against Russia. The Hungarian people themselves declared their desire for neutrality at the start of their fight for freedom. But in view of the record of Soviet treachery and brutality which ensued, can one imagine the Hungarian people having friendly feelings for the present Soviet regime for years to come? And are we therefore going to abandon the cause of freedom in Hungary merely because it is at present an anti-Soviet cause for which so much justification has been presented.

Some will say that it should be left to the United Nations. But, in his address on Saturday, President Eisenhower referred to the inability of the United Nations to be effective in the case of Hungary. He said, and I quote:

The United Nations therefore can always be helpful, but it cannot be a wholly dependable protector of freedom when the ambitions of the Soviet Union are involved.

I certainly agree that not only can we not depend on the United Nations to protect the cause of Hungarian freedom but we must frankly admit that its efforts have been a complete failure. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Members have seen

the newspaper story from Budapest on the front page of today's papers, a story whose lead paragraph reads:

Premier Janos Kadar's regime today crushed the last hope for political freedom in Hungary in announcing an old-style Communist dictatorship of the proletariat.

Even as we are speaking here, Russian tanks in Budapest are drawn up before the secret police building. The Hungarian puppet government has announced a return to a system of political control that is even tighter than the system before the revolution took place last October. The Hungarian people are worse off today than they were before the revolution started, even in spite of the fact that the United Nations has attempted to take certain action in this respect.

And yet this same puppet regime is requesting the United Nations and "Western Nations" for financial and economic assistance to strengthen its control over the Hungarian people. I think it is obvious to everyone that when Hungary finally achieves its freedom, it will either be through the unsupported efforts of the Hungarian people themselves or through positive support given by nations such as our own.

Many ardent supporters of peaceful liberation seem to believe that the Hungarians were wrong to stage a violent uprising; that they should follow the line of peaceful evolution as the Poles are now attempting to do. I will admit that such an approach might have been the more practical one. On the other hand, we certainly cannot condemn the brave Hungarians for their uprising against tyranny and fighting for freedom. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the House will recall these noble words: "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security." The question now, Mr. Speaker, is whether this Government is prepared to support such action on the part of others.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to commend the gentleman for the outstanding statement he has brought to the attention of the Members of the House regarding the Hungarian situation. I endorse the thoughts and comments set out in his statement. May I add that the gentleman from Michigan was a very diligent and hard working member of the special committee in the 83d Congress investigating Communist aggression.

I served as a member of that committee. We held hearings in this country and abroad. Over 200 witnesses testified before that committee investigating

Communist aggression. Some of these witnesses were leaders of former free countries which are now Communist captive countries. Others were leaders of religion, professions, business, and labor. This committee assimilated an avalanche of testimony exposing the criminality, physical tortures, and tyrannical inflictions which the Soviet leaders perpetrated on the captive countries, including Hungary. When the work of that committee was completed, the gentleman from Michigan, including myself and other members of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ], and others, submitted a resolution to the House asking that this testimony and our recommendations be sent to the United Nations. I firmly believe that had the Congress 2 years ago sent our findings, recommendations, and testimony to the United Nations for consideration before the General Assembly the facts and revelations would have alarmed the world. Now we find that practically a repetition of the tyrannical atrocities took place in Hungary during the last couple of months that our committee revealed took place in Hungary and other captive countries 12 to 15 years ago. In fact, the reason, the unfortunate reason, that the testimony and records and recommendations of our committee were not sent to the United Nations was that the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, asked that our resolution be not acted on pending the meeting to be held at the summit in Geneva. I happened to be chairman of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee in the previous Congress, and we had an avalanche of revealing testimony of the same atrocities committed against the Poles. This was revealed in the 82d Congress. Four years ago, as chairman of the Katyn Committee, I filed a similar resolution, asking that our findings be sent to the United Nations. Secretary of State Dulles asked that the Katyn resolution not be acted upon because of the pending negotiations on the armistice that were then taking place in Korea. I heard the President when he addressed the Congress here last Saturday. I will quote his words taken from his speech. He said:

International communism, of course, seeks to mask its purposes of domination by expressions of good will and by superficially attractive offers of political, economic, and military aid. But any free nation, which is the subject of Soviet enticement, ought, in elementary wisdom, to look behind the mask. Remember Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The President could have added Poland and Hungary and other captive nations to those three nations. I firmly believe that had the findings of the committee investigating Communist aggression, of which the gentleman from Michigan was a member, been sent to the United Nations and had the findings and recommendations of the Katyn Committee of the 82d Congress been forwarded to the United Nations, I firmly believe that the result of laying before the United Nations and laying before the

people of the world what happened at Katyn, and the revelations of the committee in the 84th Congress, would have contributed a great deal possibly toward averting what occurred in Hungary during the last few months.

Our greatest weapon against the Communists is to inform the people of the world the truth about the Communist conspiracy.

Two congressional committees have recorded sworn testimony of hundreds of witnesses who testified how the Soviet leaders succeeded in placing 800 million humans in slavery during the last 25 years.

The Geneva Conference proved to be a great mistake. The leaders of two great world democracies flew to Geneva to break bread and sit in conference with two world criminals.

Immediately the two Soviet leaders launched a propaganda trip through the Middle East to advertise their new prestige and lay the foundation for most of our present Middle East troubles.

The recommendations and comments of Mr. BENTLEY on the floor this afternoon are indeed practical and should be given serious consideration by the President and Secretary Dulles.

Mr. BENTLEY. I want to thank my friend from Indiana for his contribution. I certainly agree with him in regard to the findings of those committees. I want to say to the House that the gentleman from Indiana has distinguished himself in the last several years in Congress by taking the lead in the effort to inform the American people of the true nature of communism.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I have but 3½ minutes left and have not completed my statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the termination of the special order of the gentleman from Michigan, that I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. I would like, if I may, at this time to ask consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on this subject, this to include the requests that have already been made to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for focusing our attention on this important problem. This is, as has been said, indeed a real contribution to our thinking.

Mr. Speaker, the whole free world—indeed, all people of the world who knew of the events have been stunned and shocked at recent events in Hungary. The bravery of the people of Hungary who rose up against their Communist oppressors is perhaps unequalled in modern history. That these people, subjected to Communist terror and continually ground under the heel of tyrannical masters, should have the courage to fight tanks literally with their bare hands, knowing full well the futility of their cause, is something for all who love freedom to ponder long and well.

We cannot, of course, measure at this time the full effects of the uprising in Hungary. That is something which only time and the march of history will be able to record conclusively. However, we can at this time begin to judge some of the more immediate repercussions of events in Hungary.

Certainly we have overwhelming evidence from all sides that the bloody stamping out of Hungarian resistance has met with the condemnation of all the civilized world with the exception of those satellite nations so closely bound to Russia that they dare not speak their minds.

Among Communists all over the world the horrible aftereffects of the Hungarian uprising have opened the eyes of even the strongest zealots of the Communist line to the real meaning and methods of modern communism. In the ranks of the intellectuals of France, for instance, there are marked signs of disaffection with the men and operations of the Kremlin.

The effect on the neutral powers of the world has been perhaps more significant. Even among these people, who pride themselves on staying aloof from the entanglements of clashing ideologies and have more often than not sided with the Communist line, there have been encouraging signs of awakening to the true colors of the Russian bear.

This was evident at the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Bangkok in November, which I attended, where such neutral powers as India emphatically condemned Russian tactics in Hungary. It was clear from the sentiments expressed by nation after nation at the Interparliamentary Union Conference that the Russians have been set back drastically in their efforts to gain further allies and footholds in the Far East.

But in our interest in the ways in which Communist suppression tactics in Hungary have lost them supporters all over the world, we cannot for a moment forget those courageous people who first ignited this latest spark of anti-Communist sentiment. As our hearts go out to them in this hour of darkness, we all hope and pray that the day will not be too long delayed until they join us in the sunlight of freedom.

We cannot give tangible aid to those tragic victims of tyranny who are still

behind the Iron Curtain. We who are free and secure in our freedom and strength should not, however, remain silent in the face of such brutal suppression.

Aside from the help we can give to the victims who escape, we as members of the legislative arm of the strongest of the free nations of the world, can and should express our repugnance and indignation over the recent brutalities the Communist conspiracy has wreaked in Hungary.

I am therefore introducing today a concurrent resolution designed to express our condemnation and revulsion that a member of the United Nations should resort to such tactics. Since the ruthless suppression of the Hungarian people is clearly in violation of the charter of the United Nations, this resolution calls upon the United States to continue to press for an investigation of the issues as to such violations by the United Nations, or by such other means as may be most appropriate.

It is my hope that Congress will pass this resolution unanimously, to demonstrate to the whole world that these hapless victims of Communist oppression are not forgotten, but that we are conscious of the bestial acts of the Soviet overlords which some day will bring their day of retribution.

There is immediate and effective action which can be taken by the United States to help those who have left the tragic inferno that is Hungary today. This is by means of enacting legislation to facilitate the flow of Hungarian refugees into this country.

I have been conferring with various representatives of pertinent government agencies on this subject, and it is my intention, when the administration's ideas have been developed in concise form, to introduce a bill aiding the flow of Hungarian refugees to our land.

By this decisive and affirmative action, Congress can express the sentiment of the whole Nation. By our action, the United States can once again stand before the world as Emma Lazarus depicted us in her poem on the base of the Statue of Liberty, offering a haven to "our huddled masses yearning to be free."

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman from New York who made a very fine speech. I may say that I will be looking with great interest to receiving his resolution before our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has made a remarkable speech. I believe, however, that I should rise at this time to pay tribute to President Eisenhower and other officials of our Government for the remarkable job that has been done at Camp Kilmer now Camp Mercy, N. J., in receiving and caring for the Hungarian refugees. I can speak with authority because I have visited that camp three times in recent weeks. While the Soviet Government has been writing in Hungary a story of tyranny,

hatred, and oppression, our country at Camp Mercy, N. J., has been writing a story of love, compassion, and mercy.

The United States Army under the able leadership of Brig. Gen. Sidney C. Wooten, is caring for the refugees today. At the very outset he and his aides combed the armed facilities of the United States in order to obtain for Camp Mercy men of Hungarian extraction who could act as interpreters and who could be helpful to the newcomers.

These refugees are fed well, they are cared for well in every particular. I have spoken with many of them. Most of them are teen-agers and I can add they are young men and young women of character. We should be glad to see them coming to our country. I spoke with a young woman, 23 years of age, who was a machine gunner in the Freedom Forces. She had accounted for some seven or eight Soviet soldiers. She knew that to be true, but at the same time she had been wounded in the body with eight Soviet bullets. She is expected to recover and resume her way in our beloved America. I saw and chatted with 15-year-olds who climbed on and hacked away at Soviet tanks with hammers. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that I found those people most appreciative of the reception accorded them, and they are so happy that they are on freedom's shore.

I do not think the gentleman from Michigan would want the Record to fail to show that our Government has gone all out in caring for these refugees.

Mr. BENTLEY. I certainly appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. Personally, I want to commend the wonderful job done by the members of our own armed services in getting these people over here as expeditiously as they have. A marvelous job has been done. I do not quarrel with that at all. It is only with respect to other things that I referred to that more has not been done.

Would the gentleman permit me to read this one paragraph, and then I will have finished.

Two days ago we listened to our great President request authority that would enable him to guarantee our protection to the peoples of the Middle East. Surely, the peoples now under Communist slavery as richly and fully deserve our protection as any others. Surely, we will not say that some men will be free and others must be slaves merely because their homeland lies in a different part of the world. If we are willing to defend freedom and independence in one part of the world, we should be willing to defend it everywhere. Let us meet this challenge as leaders of free men, let us show the noble freedom fighters of Hungary that their honored dead shall not have died in vain, and let us so conduct ourselves that liberty and justice, under God, shall continue to be the inalienable right of all men in all parts of this earth.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. I want to join my colleagues in complimenting the gentleman from Michigan on the very

strong, forthright statement he has made about the situation in Hungary. Once again our colleague's service in the Foreign Service stands him in good stead to tell us in the House what the situation is among the people he has worked with.

I had the privilege in the last month to join with the Vice President on a tour of Austria and Hungary up to the Hungarian border. I hope to be able to express myself at greater length when we go into debate on the situation when the immigration law is brought up for discussion on the floor.

I would like to say that the gentleman has mentioned the fact that the people in Hungary have suffered grievously and are probably worse off than they were before the revolt. There is no question in my mind that international communism has suffered and is much worse off now than before the revolt came about. I hope we will not let the people of the world, and those in other countries who are resisting international communism, believe we have let the people of Hungary down.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I want to ask the gentleman one question. I am in full accord with the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana about these reports. They were held up from the United Nations on account of the recommendations of the Secretary of State. Are those reports still in existence?

Mr. BENTLEY. Oh, yes. They were printed and distributed by our committee. We have many copies still available, but they were not transmitted officially to the United Nations, as I understand it.

Mr. BURDICK. Officially or otherwise, the United Nations should have them.

Mr. BENTLEY. I agree with that.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, generally, as I understand it, the President wants Congress to declare a policy which this Government will follow in regard to aggressions against countries in the Middle East.

In wording that policy, the President wants authority from Congress to enable him to send troops at the request of the United Nations, and thereby resist such aggression by force. I am entirely favorable to stopping aggression, but I fear this request is unconstitutional. Under the President's plan and the authority now asked of Congress, a real war could start any time we met aggression by force, and thus a war would be begun without any further declaration from Congress.

The Constitution provides that Congress, and Congress alone, has the power to declare war. Can Congress delegate this power to the President or anybody else? We might find ourselves engaged in a war of any size, without Congress doing any more than it will be asked to do now, when there is no war in sight.

The authority the President asks is the power to wage war if necessary. Hence, the result is that Congress is exercising its power to declare war by delegating that power to the President, and I fear this is contrary to the Constitution. As I see it, Congress cannot delegate this power.

It might be that in the event of a move to stop aggression I would be in favor of it, but if a war broke out, I would have no voice in the matter, as that power I would have already voted away in voting for the power and authority the President now asks.

Very much the same power as the President now requests is contained in the NATO agreement. There we are obligated to enter into a hot war whenever any one of the signatories to the NATO agreement or pact is attacked. Congress will have nothing to do about that, as it lost its authority by the Government's agreeing to the pact. If the Russians attacked West Germany tomorrow we would be in a hot war without any declaration from Congress. Inasmuch as I have always maintained we had no constitutional right to make such an agreement, as it takes away from Congress the power to declare war, the present request is similar. I can see no difference between the NATO pact and what the President now proposes. Under the express terms of the Constitution Congress should not surrender this power to declare war.

The President could well define his foreign policy under the power he now already has, and I am sure the country would approve it, but we should not go so far as to permit a war to be started without having Congress pass directly on the subject at the time the occasion arose. The President might feel that a war should be started, while Congress at the time might differ. I believe this President would handle the matter to the satisfaction of the American people without any further action by the Congress. But we might sometime have a President who is not so well versed on foreign affairs. We had better stay with the Constitution. It wouldn't take the President 3 hours to get a declaration of war any time the facts warranted it, as was demonstrated in the declaration of war against Germany and Japan.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. I want to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Michigan for the valuable and splendid contribution he has made. He is so well informed on the subject that I would like to ask him a question which perhaps he can answer. During the past week I received a letter from one of our colleagues in the House asking that I join in a petition to the President of the United States asking that this country withdraw its recognition from the puppet government of Hungary. I am wondering whether he has any thoughts on the matter.

Mr. BENTLEY. I may say that I signed the petition of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] but I

made one reservation with respect to the withdrawal, that some provision has to be made with respect to Cardinal Mindszenty, who is a refugee in our Budapest Legation, before we talk about breaking off diplomatic relations.

Mr. SCHERER. May I make this observation? I am wondering if the Members of this House, in considering the withdrawal petition to the President to withdraw recognition of the puppet government of Hungary, should not go to the real cause, the heart of the problem, and hit the real culprit, namely, that a petition be directed to the President of the United States asking for the withdrawal of recognition of Soviet Russia.

Mr. BENTLEY. I may say to the gentleman if such a petition is circulated, I would be among the first to sign it.

Mr. SCHERER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan for the excellent statement he has made concerning the Hungarian revolution.

I am in accord with his views, which are based upon his intimate knowledge of the Hungarian people and also indicates a great deal of research and knowledge of foreign affairs as they relate to the Soviet Union.

The great courage and heroism of the Hungarian people in their struggle against the armed might of the Kremlin with their bare hands and at great loss of lives and property is one of the most amazing efforts of any nation in world history for freedom and liberty. The Hungarian people have not only shown the way, at great loss, to the other satellite states but have shown the world the great stamina and determination they have to liberate themselves from Russian control.

The Hungarian revolution is the greatest example of a Christian uprising against atheistic communism and should give heart and hope to all Christian nations that have been suppressed by Russia.

I am happy to associate myself with Mr. BENTLEY in his recommendation and urge that all possible help be given to the people of Hungary to encourage them in their valiant fight for freedom.

I have also signed a petition urging the President to withdraw recognition of the present puppet government in Hungary, which was also signed by many other Members of Congress. The petition reads as follows:

We, the undersigned Members of the Congress, irrespective of political party affiliation, but being entirely cognizant of the savage and reprehensible conduct of the Soviet Union in its current massacre of innocent, helpless, and freedom-seeking peoples of the nation of Hungary, do hereby petition the President of the United States to act as follows:

1. We strongly urge you, Mr. President, to completely withdraw recognition, in the

name of the people of the United States of America, of the puppet government of Hungary that is now headed by Janos Kadar and imposed upon the people of Hungary by the Soviet Union. Moreover, we urge you to refuse recognition of any Soviet-imposed puppet government of Hungary that might succeed the Kadar government.

2. We suggest, Mr. President, in view of the continued warfare in Hungary, that you explore through appropriate channels, the feasibility of intervention in Hungary by a police force comprised of representatives of various members of the United Nations.

GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
15th District of California.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the great and powerful United States will render every assistance to the valiant patriots of Hungary who since the days of their great leader and advocate of freedom and liberty, Kossuth, have kept alive the spark of democracy in Europe which flowed into bloody revolution against the arrogant and heartless Russian occupation of their native land.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], for securing this time to discuss the gallantry of the Hungarian fight for freedom.

It is shocking to find the administration so unprepared and without plans to assist people of a nation in obtaining their God-given rights.

We on the Foreign Affairs Committee are now holding hearings on a resolution "to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence."

Is this consistent with the lack of action in Eastern Europe? I agree with Mr. BENTLEY's statement in reference to our fight for Independence—that "it is truly fortunate that the help we received at that time from France and other countries was not confined to relief packages and resolutions condemning George III."

I insert at this point an article from America magazine of November 17:

HUNGARY: STORY OF HEROISM AND PERFDITY

We have no words to describe the courage and agony of the Hungarian people. We have no words to describe the bestial cruelty of their Soviet oppressors. So long as the light of freedom burns anywhere, the gallant rising of the Hungarians against the soul-destroying rule of communism will thrill human hearts. So long as the light of freedom burns, the brutal perfidy of Soviet Russia will be remembered with unspeakable loathing and disgust. To such depths of barbarism can man made in God's own image fall. To such heights of heroism can he soar.

Though we lack the words, the story of the Hungarian tragedy must nevertheless be told. In stark outline, this is what history will record.

On the night of October 29, with the 7-day-old rebellion against Communist domination still unappeased, the desperate Titoist Premier, Imre Nagy, announced that he was demanding forthwith the withdrawal of Russian troops from Budapest. The next afternoon Soviet tanks began moving out of the battered city. In Moscow Marshal Georgi Zhukov told a press conference that Russia was prepared to discuss a revision of the Warsaw pact. An official Soviet Gov-

ernment statement quickly confirmed this. It said:

"The Soviet Union is ready to examine with the other Socialist states which are participants in the Warsaw treaty the question of the Soviet troops stationed in the * * * Hungarian and Rumanian Republics [and] in the Polish Republic."

To this statement the embattled Hungarians reacted with unrestrained joy. In Washington President Eisenhower expressed the cautions hope that if the Soviet Union meant what it said, the world might witness "the greatest forward stride toward justice, trust, and understanding among nations in our generation."

That was the high tide of the Hungarian revolt. The Nagy government had by this time been broadened to include non-Communist parties. Cardinal Mindszenty, symbol of Hungarian independence, was safely back in Budapest. Town after town was in the hands of the rebels. Free elections were on the way.

Then on Thursday morning, October 31, the Soviet tanks headed back for Budapest. Premier Nagy immediately protested to the Soviet Ambassador. He did more: he repudiated the Warsaw pact, announced Hungarian neutrality and appealed to the United Nations. He wrote to the U. N. Secretary General:

"I request Your Excellency promptly to put on the agenda of the General Assembly the question of Hungary's neutrality and defense of this neutrality by the four great powers."

Friday a heavily reinforced Red Army was fanning out in all directions. It seized airfields, occupied all important rail junctions, blocked the main highways. When Nagy again protested to the Soviet Ambassador, he was solemnly assured that "no additional Soviet military formation had been introduced into Hungary." The Ambassador blandly explained that the planes and tanks at the Budapest airport were there solely to remove Russian civilians and wounded soldiers.

In New York, where the Security Council was considering the Hungarian appeal, Arkady A. Sobolev, the Soviet representative, dutifully discharged his ignoble role in the elaborate deception. He affirmed that reports of Soviet tanks moving back into Hungary were "utterly unfounded."

For a few more hours the perfidious Russian Communists carried on their drama of deceit. In Budapest the Soviet Ambassador talked soothingly to Nagy about a regroupment of troops. At a secret rendezvous a joint Russian-Hungarian military committee ostensibly worked on plans for the orderly withdrawal of Soviet troops. Saturday afternoon a member of the new Hungarian Cabinet, fooled by this elaborate Soviet duplicity, told reporters that the situation looked hopeful.

Then at dawn on Sunday the Russians struck. They struck with 8 divisions—7 of them armored—and fleets of bombers. In a broadcast from Budapest Premier Nagy announced that Soviet troops had attacked "with the clear intention to overthrow the lawful, democratic Government of the Hungarian people." Within a few hours most of the Nagy Cabinet were prisoners. Cardinal Mindszenty was reported safe in the United States legation. One by one the Hungarian radio stations went silent. In Vienna, toward the middle of the afternoon, listeners heard this heartbreaking message:

"Civilized people of the world: on the watchtower of 1,000-year-old Hungary the last flames begin to go out. The Soviet Army is attempting to crush our troubled hearts. Their tanks and guns are roaring over Hungarian soil.

"People of Europe, civilized people of the world, in the name of liberty and solidarity, we are asking you to help * * * Listen to

our cry. Start moving. Extend to us brotherly hands."

Under the circumstances no brotherly hand could be extended. To have answered the Hungarian appeal with armed legions of free men would have precipitated world war III. President Eisenhower appealed to Moscow to withdraw its troops. The U. N. General Assembly condemned the Soviet Union. The Holy Father warned the Communists that "the just freedom of peoples can never be drowned in blood."

None of these appeals was, of course, effective. With a sickening crash the Iron Curtain dropped again along the Austro-Hungarian frontier. Save for a single clandestine radio station, which reported still unconquered pockets of resistance, the only voice that sounded from the Hungarian watchtower was the alien voice of the conqueror. It announced the formation of a new Government of "peasants and workers" headed by the Titoist Janos Kadar. Fittingly, the free world learned of the new program from Radio Moscow.

And in another editorial of the same magazine, *America*, of November 10, article entitled "Hungary: Graveyard of Red Myths," was stated:

We know now—

That communism, in Hungary and elsewhere, survives only with the help of a foreign army;

That the Soviet army's role is to protect the regime from its own people;

That the youth and the intelligentsia are today the most dangerous anti-Red forces;

That the years of absolute control over the economic life of a Communist country have produced such misery and discontent that a small spark is sufficient to touch off a gigantic conflagration all over the country;

That the armies of the satellite regimes are absolutely unreliable, not only for the U. S. S. R. but for their own governments as well;

That in a free election communism would be swept away.

Since we are speaking of Red-sponsored myths that have crumbled in the ruins of Budapest and a dozen other centers in Hungary, we may allude to some of our own clichés that need revision. These include the idea that revolution is impossible in a Red-run country and that liberation can come only from the outside. We have underestimated the desire for freedom among the youth in Communist lands. We have apparently underrated the power of the church and the family and of decency in general, at the same time that we were overimpressed by the staying power of oppression based on fear and terror.

Honesty should also compel us to admit that the Hungarian people did what they did on their own, without any help, or hope of help, from the United States or the United Nations. We have been too prone to give up on a people who, like the Hungarians, for a thousand years have kept guard on the frontiers of the civilization we call Christian. From Stettin to Trieste the Iron Curtain is shaken. The heroic peoples of Eastern Europe, too long separated from the community to which they belong, are forcing up that barrier by the strength of their own moral courage.

It is significant that the leader of Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, to whom the United States and the West have given so much military and economic aid, showed his true colors by publicly assessing the suppression of the Hungarian revolt by the U. S. S. R. as completely justified.

THE HUNGARIAN SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that I was on the floor today to listen to the speech made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], which I consider to be a courageous one, a timely one, and a marked contribution to the affirmative deliberations of this body. I have discussed this subject in the past before the Congress met. We now have at least 10 weeks gone by with only expressions of sympathy for the people of Hungary. While sympathy is all right when one is dead and you express it to the bereaved relatives, it does not lend much hope to the living who are fighting and dying for liberty. As I followed the newspaper reports in connection with Hungary, my mind went back in history to those days which constituted the inception of our own Government, and to me the saying of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death," became something living, and in Hungary with its thousands, yes, millions of people, a little nation of about 9 million, whether they realized it or not in their conscious minds, were imbued with that desire under law and under God, and that is nothing more or less, when they are willing to give their lives, than to "give me liberty or give me death." Like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] and my other colleagues and countless millions of others, I have been concerned and I have asked myself the question "What can we do? What can my Government do?" On November 25 in Boston I made a speech and I reduced it to writing. I shall later incorporate it in the RECORD. I very seldom reduce my remarks to writing; I usually speak from notes, but on this occasion I reduced my entire remarks to writing in which I discussed the Middle East situation and also the Hungarian situation. At that time I suggested one of two alternatives for the United Nations to take. This was after the resolution had been adopted by the United Nations: First, send observers over to the border of Hungary. That is a concrete act, an overt act. Or better still, second, have the observers fly into Budapest in a United Nations marked plane. It would take a little courage, but this is a time when courage is necessary. When they arrived there, they would either have to let them stay there, which would be a victory, or they would have to expel them, which would also be a victory in connection, at least, with worldwide public opinion.

I might say that a few weeks prior to that there was a conference at the White House at which my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and others were present. I asked the question, "Are we going to recognize the Kadar government in Hungary that the gang in the Soviet Union have put in there, it being a nonlegitimate government?" As far back as that, 8 weeks ago, I raised that question. That was also incorporated in the speech that I made in Boston on November 25.

In consequence of some questions that I asked on that occasion, one of the high career officials of the State Department called me up that afternoon, saying he wanted to see me. I was always glad to see him, of course, but on this occasion particularly to get some information I had asked of Under Secretary Hoover about the status of Cardinal Mindszenty.

He came up to see me. We discussed the question. I talked about the observers; why not send them to the border. I did not have in mind at that time the other suggestion of flying them in on a marked United Nations plane. I did not think the Communists would dare to shoot that plane down. At that time they were not letting the Red Cross in with medicines and food. I made the suggestion about the observers going to the border and also I said, "Why do not the Red Cross trucks move up to the border of Hungary and say, 'We want to go in to bring relief to these unfortunate people,' and then have them refuse the Red Cross?"

World-wide public opinion would be aroused and while we are dealing here with a Communist dictatorship, some recognition sometimes must be given even by the Kremlin to world public opinion.

Within 24 hours that was done. I do not know whether my suggestion contributed to it or not. I do not want to claim credit for it. But within 24 hours the trucks went up and, Mr. Speaker, you will remember they said, "No, we will not let you in. You have to be screened and go into Hungary by way of Yugoslavia." The Red Cross refused to do that, and properly so. But within 24 hours after that refusal, they recanted and permitted the trucks to go in. How much of what they brought in has gotten to the populace I do not know. How much my suggestion to this high career official contributed to that, I do not know. But I made the suggestion to him less than 24 hours before.

The reason the Communists are in there, the reason the Soviet Communist forces are in there, is because the point which the uprising had reached was a point where the people were rising up against any form of Communist government. That is why they went in. And that is why they have not gone into other places. I do not think they are satisfied with the situation in Poland, but they feel they can give a little, consolidate their position, consolidate their position within the Soviet Union and then they can move in and tighten up once more. The situation is the same as when Khrushchev visited Hungary only a few days ago and Kadar came out with this statement yesterday, that appeared in today's papers and to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] so properly and aptly referred.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan that we cannot have two courses so far as action is concerned by the United Nations in operation at the same time, one where the U. N. can move against democracies when they are declared to be aggressors and the other where the U. N. cannot move against Communist nations when they are declared to be aggressors.

As far as the sending of the United Nations forces into Suez is concerned, I am one of those who regret that England and France did not take all of the Suez Canal and then start negotiating from there. I have no hesitancy in stating that. It was not a question of colonialism, and I introduced the anti-colonialism resolution in the last Congress and it went through under my leadership. It was a question of the violation of an international agreement, the usurpation of power, a question of the future use of a canal which means so much to countless nations throughout the world. Colonialism was not involved. It was a question of use of the canal involving the very life blood of nations and their very existence.

I approved of the U. N. police force going in there. If we can only send it into the Suez and other areas where democratic nations or non-Communist nations are declared to be the aggressors, and the U. N. cannot send a force into the areas of the world where the Communist nations are in control and declared to be the aggressors, then that would have serious implications as to the future existence of the United Nations itself.

One thing is certain, that the United Nations resolutions in relation to Hungary have been completely disregarded.

There are many things we can do. This is a fight of the spirit that is going on in Hungary, within Hungary today. It may be Poland tomorrow, or Lithuania or Czechoslovakia another day, or some other satellite country. This is the fight of men and women who want to be free under their own law. It is the eternal fight for liberty. This is a fight against the worst force and power that the known history of man records. In the past there were trying periods, but usually the aggressor was seeking additional territory, and lust and loot followed in the wake. This is for that, but it is also for the conquest of the mind and the spirit.

The desire for liberty was not man-made and the desire for liberty cannot be man-destroyed. It can be man-suppressed for a period. That is what important parts of the world are undergoing. The people of Hungary have expressed their God-given right, their desire for liberty. But man can never destroy what God created; what man did not create. Man can preserve and strengthen the exercise of liberty or man can suppress it, but man can never destroy it. That is what the battle is that is going on over there, whether in their conscious minds those poor, humble human beings like you and I realize it or not. This eternal fight is going to go on.

There are involved other countries, because the people of other countries who hate the Communist dictator and overlord are looking to America. They are hoping and praying for liberty, for an early day of deliverance. They pray to God and their hopes are toward America. They are evaluating everything we do or that we do not do. There are many things that we can do—there are economic sanctions—volunteers if necessary, the other side uses them—

that is one of the convenient way for them to carry out their designs. Whether or not the point has arrived yet, I am not going to say, but certainly there are many things that we can do. We could publicly say that we will not recognize the Kadar regime. That would be a stimulating action. United Nations observers could at least go to the border. It might be well for this body through one of its committees to appoint a subcommittee to go over there to Austria, officially. That, at least, would have a contributing effect because it would percolate through and get to the people of Hungary and Poland and Czechoslovakia and other countries because one of the great weaknesses of communism is the desire of countless of millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain to some day again be freemen and freewomen under their own laws.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman from Massachusetts said that we should do something. You said you would favor withdrawing recognition of the puppet Government of Hungary. Do you not think the most effective thing we could do is to withdraw recognition of the real culprit, the Soviet Union?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, absolutely. As a matter of fact, in 1938 or thereabouts, an appropriation bill was before us for consideration. I offered an amendment to the effect that no part of the funds appropriated for the Department of State could be used to maintain an embassy in the Soviet Union. On a teller vote, it was defeated by about 20 votes, as I remember.

Mr. SCHERER. Would that not be the most effective thing we could do insofar as the rest of the world is concerned?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Soviet Union does not obey or comply with the resolutions passed by the United Nations, then not only that, but the question of the refusal to recognize within the United Nations certain countries properly arises and might also be acted upon. We are not going to win this battle by inaction. We are not going to win this battle by fear. We are not going to win this battle by drifting. To the Communists and to the dictatorships, that is a sign of weakness. It encourages them to go further. To them that is appeasement, and the policy of appeasement, we know from Chamberlain's experience, is the road to war. In addition to what has been said, there is one other subject that I want to discuss. I regret very much, I might add, that this statement has been made. I have here a letter dated December 4 from Robert C. Hill, Assistant Secretary of State. Like other colleagues, I might say, a few days prior to November 19, when I wrote the Secretary of State, I received a telegram from the Emergency Committee for Arms to Hungary. I sent it to the Secretary of State. On December 4, I received a reply from Robert C. Hill in which he acknowledged the receipt of my letter and of the enclosed telegram. In his letter, he said among other things:

As President Eisenhower remarked in his news conference on November 14, "The

United States doesn't now, and never has, advocated open rebellion by an undefended populace against force over which they could not possibly prevail."

In order that the RECORD might be complete, I include at this point the entire letter.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 4, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: I have received your letter of November 19 transmitting a telegram from the Emergency Committee for Arms to Hungary in which that committee recommends that the United States send arms to the Hungarian people.

It has been the position of the United States Government that the Hungarian situation can best be dealt with through the United Nations. It is our hope that through the joint efforts of freedom loving nations working within and through that organization a solution will be found which will assure that the Hungarian people achieve their aims of greater liberty, national independence and the withdrawal of foreign troops. The provision of arms by the United States, if such were indeed feasible, to the Hungarian insurgents who are faced with the overwhelming might of the Soviet army would not, it is felt, contribute to such a solution. As President Eisenhower remarked in his news conference on November 14, "The United States doesn't now, and never has, advocated open rebellion by an undefended populace against force over which they could not possibly prevail."

I am returning the telegram of the Emergency Committee herewith. Thank you for bringing its views to the Department's attention.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

When I read that, my mind went back to the Declaration of Independence and I said—that is the policy—it is all right for one to think it as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] well said—my thoughts may be this way, but it is another thing to state a policy. That is the policy of our Government. My mind goes back to the Declaration of Independence. It is well to read and reread these famous documents that are the fundamental law of our land so that once in a while our memory may be refreshed. What does the Declaration of Independence say? In part, it says:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the

same object, evidence a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted 5 additional minutes.)

MR. McCORMACK. In 1775 and 1776, had the head of France said that to the colonies and those in the Continental Army who were fighting for independence, that would be practically saying to them, "Quit. Do not fight. Ask the King of England if he will send over some Duke of England to be King over here while subject to the domination of England, and go through an evolutionary stage."

I wonder if we would have a United States of America today.

Those words are understood abroad. They are understood here. I say it, and I say it with regret, that those words ignore the very history of our country and they constitute an abandonment of one of the most important grounds upon which those who signed the Declaration of Independence based the cause of the colonists.

Are not conditions oppressive over there? Is there anyone who denies it? Are they not living under inhuman conditions? Is not martyrdom being undergone by those people? Is there not just cause for them to rebel? Have they not exhausted all their means? Is there not just cause? That is the very origin of our Government, yet that statement says to Hungary and the people of other subjugated countries: "Do not do it, no matter how oppressive conditions are."

I hope that policy will be changed.

MR. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. McCORMACK. I yield.

MR. FLOOD. It occurred to me that the best witnesses the distinguished majority leader could have to answer that question would be if we could breathe life into the two pictures that stand facing the gentleman on this wall. He has two most eloquent witnesses to give the answer "Yes" to his questions.

MR. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. This is what is contained in this letter. That language speaks for itself. We are all Americans and we know the history of our country, and if there ever was just cause for a people under hopeless conditions to rebel, it exists in the people of Hungary.

MR. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. McCORMACK. I yield.

MR. KEATING. Would it not be fair to characterize that sentence to which the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred, as not saying, "Do not do it," but rather as saying, "It is not the policy of our Government as a government to actively encourage an uprising in a foreign country where only hopeless bloodshed can ensue?"

It is not necessary for the Government as such to be on record as encouraging an uprising in a foreign country under such circumstances.

MR. McCORMACK. I do not agree with that latter statement; I certainly disavow that. If we were a dictatorship that is one thing; but the United States is not, and the gentleman's last statement I thoroughly disavow. This is stating to the world what our policy is.

MR. KEATING. In other words, it is the gentleman's position that our Government should actively as a government encourage an uprising in these states?

MR. McCORMACK. No; I did not say that. I said our Government should not actively discourage; that is what I said. That is the meaning of my statement.

MR. KEATING. I agree that we should not actively discourage rebellion. Will the gentleman read that again?

MR. McCORMACK. Yes.

"The United States does not now and never has"—I cannot agree with that, but all right—"The United States of America does not now and never has advocated open rebellion by an undefended populace against force over which they could not possibly prevail."

Many people did not think the Thirteen Colonies could prevail.

MR. KEATING. That statement of our policy simply says we do not advocate—I repeat, advocate—open rebellion where there is no possible chance of success, but it is not saying that our Government has discouraged or will discourage active rebellion.

MR. McCORMACK. Suppose the gentleman lived in Poland and he hated the Communists; or, better still, suppose the gentleman were one of those Hungarians who are involved now; reading that, what would you think? What would you think?

MR. KEATING. The gentleman and I are in no difference as to our desires or objectives. What I am trying to do is to clarify the record as to the position of the Government. The way I interpret the sentence which the gentleman from Massachusetts has read as to our Government's policy and the statement of the President, is that it has not been the policy of our Government actively to encourage open rebellion in another country where it can only result in fruitless slaughter; but he does not say that we are discouraging active rebellion in any foreign country.

MR. McCORMACK. That language is a complete discouragement of it. Furthermore, another statement has been made that we should let these countries go through an evolutionary stage. First, they should go through the state of national communism before striving to get real liberty and emancipation from any communistic control. That is another statement that has been made. The plain letter and spirit of that statement to the people of the subjugated nations is that so far as the United States is concerned the message is: "No matter how justified you are in uprising, we frown upon it and we would not countenance it in any way." That is the clear import of that language.

MR. KEATING. The gentleman and I are in disagreement on the correct interpretation of this statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. McCormack was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEATING. The President and the administration have been repeatedly criticized by orators of the gentleman's party over the fact that they were too active in starting things in these foreign countries.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who was too active?

Mr. KEATING. This Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not me.

Mr. KEATING. I think probably that is true. I do not think my remarks are directed to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who else? Who else?

Mr. KEATING. Repeatedly on this floor and elsewhere we have heard objections to the so-called liberation policy of the Government insofar as it differed from the so-called containment policy of the preceding administration. There have been repeated instances of criticism of the Secretary of State because he was alleged to be leading us up to the brink of war by statements that were made to encourage rebellious activities in these satellite governments. The gentleman knows that that has been repeatedly said. I am happy that the gentleman from Massachusetts is directing his criticism along the opposite line.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, wait a minute; the gentleman is not going to put in the RECORD something that is not in my mind. I did not rise in a critical mood.

Mr. KEATING. I realize that. The gentleman has made an important contribution to the debate on this crucial subject.

Mr. McCORMACK. I rose to compliment the gentleman from Michigan and to state some views of my own, and to call attention to this sentence which is in a letter to me. The letter will be in the RECORD tomorrow. I also wanted to express my regret over this policy and to hope that it will be changed quickly to coincide with the policy of the United States not only since its inception but also since its origin as expressed in the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. KEATING. And the gentleman prefers the policy which would actively encourage revolution in these satellite governments?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly we should never do anything to discourage.

Mr. KEATING. That is right. With that I emphatically agree.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the other hand, encourage, yes. The expression, the operation of encouragement might be a different question under certain circumstances. I would not criticize our Government if it did not expressly state a policy of encouragement, but I do not think that anything should be stated that constitutes a policy of discouragement.

Mr. KEATING. I entirely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Which would be an abandonment of the very origin of our own country.

Mr. KEATING. May I point out that a policy of active encouragement is a delicate matter, as the gentleman from Massachusetts realizes. The implications of such a policy are very far-reaching. I know of no instance in our history where we have pursued or, at least, announced a policy of active encouragement of rebellion in another country. On the other hand, certainly we should do nothing which would discourage such action by brave patriots; in fact, our hearts go out in unbounded praise and admiration for a group of people who have the matchless courage to do what the Hungarian people did.

Mr. McCORMACK. We see what has happened in Hungary. Suppose you and I lived in Poland; we despise and hate the Communist form of government; we are looking for the day of deliverance; we want to be a part of the uprising, whether wise or not at a particular time. Our inherent rights are involved when conditions become so oppressive that we can no longer endure them. We see what happened in Hungary. Then we see this statement. We see nothing but sympathy being extended. It would not be difficult for JOHN McCORMACK, if I were in Poland, to say: "What is the use?" seeing what happened in Hungary. I might defer, I might become disillusioned, I might become depressed. We are all human beings. The law of self-preservation might become more prominent in my mind and guide my actions.

A statement of this kind is most unfortunate, I submit, and I hope that it will be rectified quickly to be consistent with the origin and the history of our country.

THE HUNGARIAN SITUATION

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of joining my colleagues who have extended their compliments on the free analysis and presentation of this very difficult problem on Hungary as presented by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan today. I direct the Chair's attention to the remarks made by my colleague from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] when he referred to the reports of the Katyn Committee and the Committee Against Communist Oppression. I join in presenting those remarks to the House.

I repeat, for the purpose of emphasis, that I seldom have heard a more carefully prepared or studied analysis of a difficult problem than was presented by our friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to re-

vide and extend remarks, was granted as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. REUSS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HENDERSON in two instances.

Mr. McDONOUGH.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mrs. FROST) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts for 5 minutes today.

Mr. POWELL for 1 hour on Thursday, January 10.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 10, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

251. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Inland Waterways Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

252. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

253. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of local participation on flood control and navigation projects of the Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2125. A bill to reorganize the civil defense functions of the Federal Govern-

ment, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 2126. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 2127. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2128. A bill to establish a pension program for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2129. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2130. A bill to establish a program of economic relief for distressed areas through a system of loans and grants in aid; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H. R. 2131. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2132. A bill to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2133. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 2134. A bill to insure that the scheduled reductions in the manufacturers excise tax on automobiles and other vehicles, and on parts and accessories therefor, will take effect on April 1, 1957; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWLER:

H. R. 2135. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 2136. A bill to amend section 124 (c) of title 28 of the United States Code so as to transfer Shelby County from the Beaumont to the Tyler division of the eastern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2137. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 2138. A bill to abolish free transmission of official Government mail matter and certain other mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2139. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2140. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2141. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "A bill to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2142. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to declare the primacy of free enterprise,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2143. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2144. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, to establish standards for the organization and operation of Government Advisory Groups; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2145. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2146. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2147. A bill to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 2148. A bill to provide that certain payments shall be made to the Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station under the conditions which obtained before the enactment of Public Law 352, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 2149. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2150. A bill to authorize loans by the Small Business Administration to alleviate unemployment in areas of substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 2151. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on certain coarse wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 2152. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 2153. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to strengthen the civil-rights statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2154. A bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2155. A bill to amend section 17 of the War Claims Act of 1948 so as to increase the classes of persons entitled to receive payment of certain claims under such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2156. A bill to provide for aid to the States in the fields of practical nursing and auxiliary hospital personnel services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2157. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2158. A bill to create a Joint Committee on Extraterrestrial Exploration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 2159. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of

Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 2160. A bill to amend section 334 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to increased allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2161. A bill to increase from 5 percent to 10 percent the amount which corporations may deduct for tax purposes for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2162. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this system by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 2163. A bill to provide for the establishment of a purchase program for domestic manganese ore for the southern Appalachian area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2164. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2165. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full annuities for individuals who have completed 30 years of service; to provide annuities thereunder to equal 50 percent of taxable wages of the 5 years of highest earnings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2166. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 2167. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2168. A bill to prohibit the disposal of certain surplus real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2169. A bill to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a child who is an invalid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2170. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consummate desirable land exchanges; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2171. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to limit the exception of Federal taxes from a discharge in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 2172. A bill to adjust the limitations imposed on veterans outpatient dental care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2173. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2174. A bill directing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit retired officers and enlisted men to use available hospital facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2175. A bill to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River development fund in the States of the lower division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2176. A bill to include certain service performed for Members of Congress as annuitable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2177. A bill to modify certain bars to payment of pension under part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2178. A bill to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2179. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2180. A bill to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2181. A bill to amend Public Law 881, 84th Congress, to grant dependency and indemnity compensation to widows of deceased veterans who at the time of death are disabled 50 percent or more and whose disabilities are service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2182. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to extend the loan benefits thereunder to all unmarried widows of eligible veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2183. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2184. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2185. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the deletion, from the records of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of any entries showing wages paid for service as an employee of the Communist Party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2186. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2187. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to increase the maximum amount of certain loans which can be insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2188. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired under the Federal reclamation laws for their moving expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2189. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes on account of the real property constituting Sunflower Village, Johnson County, Kans.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2190. A bill to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 2191. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 to provide that the term "child"

shall include a child of a veteran who is a member of the veteran's household and who becomes permanently incapable of self-support; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2192. A bill to extend the gratuitous insurance benefits granted by subsection 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to parents of certain deceased members of the Armed Forces without regard to the dependency of such parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2193. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2194. A bill making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2195. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 2196. A bill to provide medical and hospital treatment for certain non-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2197. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2198. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 2199. A bill to provide for the improvement of Fresh Water Bayou, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2200. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2201. A bill to grant a pension of \$100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2202. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2203. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2204. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2205. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHMORE (by request):

H. R. 2206. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 2207. A bill to amend section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that policies of insurance issued thereunder shall be convertible and participating; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2208. A bill to amend section 620 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to alter the period for applying for insurance thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2209. A bill to modify the basis for award of gratuitous national service life insurance to a dependent parent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2210. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 2211. A bill to require Federal officers, agencies, and employees to act in accordance with and submit to the laws of the several States relative to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water and providing that the United States shall sue and be sued in the courts of such State in litigation arising therefrom; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2212. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to include in the definition of "agriculture" the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained and operated for farming purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 2213. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 2214. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to provide tax relief for small corporations and more equitable tax treatment for persons engaged in small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2216. A bill authorizing the preparation of detailed plans for the Littleville Reservoir on the middle branch of the Westfield River in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2217. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child shall be considered the adopted child of a deceased individual where such individual, before his death, had filed an appropriate petition for the adoption of such child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2218. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the wife or widow of an insured individual shall be deemed to have been living with him, at the time required for entitlement to benefits, if at any such time they were separated without fault on her part; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for interest and taxes paid by the taxpayer for his spouse or for a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2220. A bill to establish a Medical Advisory Committee on Alcoholism in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2221. A bill to extend the time for making application for compensation for unused leave accumulated on September 1, 1946, by members or former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2222. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$700 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a

spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 2223. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2224. A bill providing for payment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2225. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of television reflector facilities and VHF translator facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2226. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2227. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of producers of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2228. A bill to readjust postal classification on certain educational materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2229. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to provide for utilization of commercial marine terminal facilities by the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2230. A bill to implement the 10-year "Mission 66" plan that has been undertaken for the public benefit concerning the rehabilitation, improvement and preservation of the national park system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2231. A bill authorizing the modification of the general comprehensive plan of improvement for the Missouri River Basin to include certain flood-control works in the Gering Valley, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2232. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2233. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a new method for determining monthly compensation in computing annuities, and to eliminate all restrictions upon the right of a spouse to receive benefits simultaneously under that act and the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2234. A bill to amend the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 so that certain awards of the Mixed Claims Commission having a residual balance of \$15,000 or less will be paid in full immediately and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2235. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2236. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to author-

ize the Secretary of the Treasury to use up to 20 percent of the national service life insurance fund for the purchase of loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2237. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration in Johnson City, Tenn. to Johnson City National Farm Loan Association and the East Tennessee Production Credit Association, local units of the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 2238. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 2239. A bill to reorganize the civil defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2240. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2241. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that surplus real property of the United States shall be disposed of only after giving former owners thereof an opportunity to repurchase such property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2242. A bill to authorize the establishment, maintenance, and operation of auxiliary communication networks composed of licensed amateur radio operators for military radio communications; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 2243. A bill to increase the rates of compensation for disability incurred in combat or outside the continental limits of the United States during a war, campaign, expedition, or conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2244. A bill to amend chapter 209, 58 Statutes at Large, which was enacted as Public Law 314, 78th Congress, approved May 27, 1944 to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 2245. A bill to provide for the modification of the Houston Ship Channel, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2246. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for the comprehensive development of the White River Basin to provide for additional hydroelectric power development, for the control of floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 2247. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall return certain mineral interests in land acquired by him for flood-control purposes, to the former owners of such land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 2248. A bill to amend subparagraph (A) of subparagraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 2249. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to exempt certain retired officers of the Armed Forces from the

operation of section 216 thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2250. A bill to exempt churches from the excise tax on bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold-mining industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to study the economic and engineering feasibility of acquiring riparian rights from the Republic of Mexico to water in the Gulf of California for the piping and pumping of water from the Gulf of California to Arizona for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday of September as Senior Citizens Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution condemning recent Communist tactics in Hungary and calling for investigation by United Nations of violations of its Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 84. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 85. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and to make inquiries, relating to the operation of the monetary and credit structure of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 86. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and to make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 87. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 86; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 88. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action on appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 2251. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of Colorado to William M. Proper; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2252. A bill for the relief of Stephanos J. Cotsoradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 2253. A bill for the relief of Arnold Rosenthal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2254. A bill for the relief of Carmela Lanza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 2255. A bill for the relief of Raymond H. Hsieh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2256. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Han Hong Wang and An-Yin Chen Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 2258. A bill for the relief of Rita Keskula Vigla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2259. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States to certain real property in Prairie County, Ark.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Anita F. Crowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2261. A bill for the relief of the Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2262. A bill for the relief of Gertrud (Scholz) Bayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 2263. A bill for the relief of White River Distributors, Inc., and certain other creditors of the Westmoreland Manganese Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 2264. A bill for the relief of Donald F. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2265. A bill for the relief of Clifford Oesterle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. R. 2266. A bill for the relief of Emilio Aluen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Banuelos-Haro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2269. A bill for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2270. A bill for the relief of Billy Shao-Ru Hwang (Wong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2271. A bill for the relief of Doring Hampac Mendoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2272. A bill for the relief of Ygnacia Osequera T. De Montes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2273. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis Galvez Buenrostro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2274. A bill for the relief of Ema Goncalves Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2275. A bill for the relief of Edgardo Villanueva Del Rosario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2276. A bill for the relief of White River Distributors, Inc., and certain other creditors of the Westmoreland Manganese Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 2277. A bill for the relief of Gumaro Rubalcava-Quezada (also known as Gumero Rubalcava-Quezada and Gelasio Juareg-Lopez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Guadalupe Aguilar-Buenrostro de Montano (also known as Victoria Rosas de Montano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2279. A bill for the relief of Antonio Alejandres-Diaz (also known as Antonio Alejandres-Valencia); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2280. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wha Dee Loo, his wife Margaret Chan Loo, and their three minor children Mary, Josephine, and John Loo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2281. A bill for the relief of Kim Sheung Fong and Kim Shing Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2282. A bill for the relief of Ivo Palva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Cornelia Minus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2284. A bill for the relief of Ralph (Raffaele) Gargiulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2285. A bill for the relief of John H. Orth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2286. A bill for the relief of Tom Pritchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2287. A bill for the relief of Irma Flora Bissessar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Charles Whaley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Sharon Elizabeth Branch (Yumi Ishiki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Philip I. Veira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2291. A bill for the relief of Abdul Ali Munshi (also known as Abdul Mojid Munshi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2292. A bill for the relief of Emilio Poglianich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2293. A bill for the relief of Valeriano Melchior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2294. A bill for the relief of Jude Anthony Branch (Koji Aoyagi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2295. A bill for the relief of Gordon Seymour Peter Beckles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2296. A bill for the relief of Horace Wilberforce King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2297. A bill for the relief of Ding Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2298. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emmeline Carter Gay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2299. A bill for the relief of Alberto Teodoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2300. A bill for the relief of Andor Muller and Rosa Muller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2301. A bill for the relief of Lloyd D. Ebanks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2302. A bill for the relief of Phyllis L. Ware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Dudley Cheesman (also known as Dudley T. Whitaker); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2304. A bill for the relief of Julian Barber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2305. A bill for the relief of Max Karl Roder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2306. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive Zaudie Makuria, a citizen and subject of Ethiopia, for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2307. A bill for the relief of Natan Zepelovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2308. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Prudence Hicks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2309. A bill for the relief of Ryon Gzoon Chough and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2310. A bill for the relief of Atara Couse Headley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2311. A bill for the relief of Joyce Delores Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2312. A bill for the relief of Pietro Pipitone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2313. A bill for the relief of Leon Popiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2314. A bill for the relief of George McPherson Gray (Reginald Pugh); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Shlomo Zalman Blumenfeld (Sol Blum); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2316. A bill for the relief of James Neville Beaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2317. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Harris, Mrs. Lydia E. Harris, and Olney Elva Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2318. A bill for the relief of Rolando Aravena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2319. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise Nanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2320. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Gallofin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2321. A bill for the relief of Rista Milosevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2322. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Strazzullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2323. A bill for the relief of Arthur Frank Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2324. A bill for the relief of Americo Discepolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2325. A bill for the relief of Anthony Valamvanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2326. A bill for the relief of Amin Rahmin Roubin, Mrs. Esther Mordkhay Roubin, and Abdul Rahmin Roubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2327. A bill for the relief of Herbert Arnold Sparks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2328. A bill for the relief of Walter Adolphus Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2329. A bill for the relief of Clayton Holmes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2330. A bill for the relief of Patrick Joseph Blewett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2331. A bill for the relief of Cecil Edgar Deonarine, Mrs. Gloria Deonarine (nee Ramjattansingh), and Jessel J. Deonarine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Hiromi Kashiwagi Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2333. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Tomas Lleno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2334. A bill for the relief of Feliciano Lazay Manendez and Josefina Vallin y Lambillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2335. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 2336. A bill for the relief of Moosa Ebrahimian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2337. A bill for the relief of Abdullah Ibrahim Hakim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2338. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of personal property damage sustained by the Security Feed & Seed Co. of Johnson City, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2339. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Soledad Tejera Suarez Herreros and her son, Rafael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 2340. A bill for the relief of William R. and Alice M. Reardon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 2341. A bill for the relief of Simon Brill and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2342. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jytte Starel Synodis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2343. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katarzyna Sachnowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2344. A bill for the relief of Margaret Shand (Chanslor); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2345. A bill for the relief of Alice Selim Nikhla Fakhouri (also known as Denise Fakhouri); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Irmgard S. King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Deckard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Constantinos F. Agoris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 2349. A bill for the relief of Manolis N. Triantafillou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Nathaniel Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Battista Campoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of the estate of Leatha Horn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2355. A bill for the relief of A. W. Mussallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 2356. A bill for the relief of Tzapik Bagdassarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution for the relief of certain spouses and minor children of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

29. Mr. MUMMA presented a resolution adopted by the 87th annual meeting of the house of delegates of the Pennsylvania State Dental Society, Harrisburg, Pa., in support of legislation amending present tax laws to permit dentists to set aside voluntarily certain amounts for retirement programs that would not be taxable during the years in which earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Radio Address by Hon. Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, on December 14, 1956, Entitled "The Bill of Rights and Hungary's Fight for Freedom," Sponsored by the Bill of Rights Commemorative Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS AND HUNGARY'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

One hundred and sixty-five years ago tomorrow, Virginia ratified the first 10 amendments to our Constitution now known as the Bill of Rights. Virginia's ratification wrote the Bill of Rights into the basic law of our land. The far-sighted vision of James Madison and a few other Founding Fathers laid down the granite foundation stone not only of our basic freedoms but of our whole American concept of the rights of man about which Europeans dreamed.

And before I turn to pressing problems of today let me observe that there is a forgotten amendment which even the Supreme Court of the United States seems to have shoved into the deep freezer. I refer to the 10th or last amendment. Let me read it to you:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Let every American remember that—"are reserved to the States or to the people."

From paying my humble tribute to the great founders of our Nation it seems appropriate tonight to speak out in behalf of the valiant Hungarian Freedom Fighters. Perhaps only a few Hungarians knew anything about our Bill of Rights. But they did understand just how precious is human freedom—and they gladly gave their lives, 50,000 or more, in a desperate and well-nigh hopeless attempt to obtain even a little freedom for themselves and their children.

Seven weeks ago the entire free world was thrilled and astonished by the news from Hungary. The impossible and the unbelievable had been achieved. The Iron Curtain had been smashed wide open by fighting Hungarian students, workers, and unorganized white collar workers. Armed with little more than magnificent courage and bare hands these heroic Hungarian Freedom Fighters had scattered their brutal secret police like dust before a gale. Hungarians had risen almost as a man against the full might of their Communist oppressors. The Red-dominated Hungarian army simply melted away or defected wholesale to the side of liberty.

By November 3 it was clear that the Hungarian patriots were in firm control of most of the country. The toppling to the ground of a huge statue of Stalin in Budapest was symbolic of the imminent collapse or overthrow of the whole Soviet system of terror and slavery.

Then came the night of November 3-4. By noon of Sunday, the 4th, the world once more had to swallow the bitter lesson of Communist perfidy and treachery. The bitter truth that so many of our wishful-thinking Pollyanna seem unable to learn is that you cannot do business with or ever trust Communists. You all know the rest of the sickening story. Masses of savage Asiatic troops poured across the frontier to overwhelm the poorly armed and exhausted freedom fighters. The Soviets brought in 5,000 tanks which systematically wiped out small units of brave men and boys—yes, and some women, too—armed only with rifles,

hand grenades, and homemade Molotov cocktails. Soviet commanders kept their infantry safely out of action. Entire buildings and blocks of dwellings were blasted to rubble by Soviet tanks if they appeared to house a few snipers.

The death toll has been estimated as over 50,000. The full, unlimited horror of Communist terror was unleashed by the super-criminals in the Kremlin. Long trains of sealed cattle cars, packed with the youth of Hungary, began their awful journeys to the slow-death camps of Siberia.

I have just returned from 5 days in Vienna. I went to Austria to do what I could to expedite entry into the United States of as many Hungarian patriots as possible. As you know, Hungarians have been fleeing from the Soviet slaughterhouse at the rate of 5,000 or 6,000 a day. Over 90,000 in Austria are now straining the resources of that small and impoverished country.

With typical Communist disregard for the truth, my visit to Austria was described by a Russian representative in the United Nations as "an indication of how definite United States circles are interested in lending special political tinge to the refugee question." Humanitarian motives are unknown to these beasts of the Kremlin.

The attitude of the refugee Hungarians surprised me. Many of them had no desire to emigrate to this country or anywhere else overseas. They want to stay as close as possible to the borders of their own country. They hope to go back in a matter of a few months when their country is freed of Soviet troops and Communist terror. I must admit that I was deeply impressed by their demeanor and fervor of their patriotism. They love their country and have no desire to leave it forever.

The Hungarian refugees with whom I talked were fearless, dignified, and proud. Unlike other refugees who often are completely demoralized and beaten down, these Hungarians held their heads high. Exhausted after days of bitter hand-to-hand fighting

and inwardly heartsick over the titanic tragedy that had overwhelmed their beloved country, they nevertheless stood proud and erect, as they have every right to do. They had done something that no other western people had ever attempted or accomplished—they had destroyed the myth of Soviet invincibility. Schoolboys, workers, and hastily armed intellectuals had made Soviet troops run like rabbits.

They had demonstrated once more to an unbelieving and propaganda saturated world that it is still possible for free men to rise with primitive weapons against heavily armed hells with no heart in the fight. The Hungarians of 1956 had brought Patrick Henry's immortal words back to life in flaming letters of fire. A blasé and intimidated world was shown once more that death holds no terror for men determined to be free.

Some of these Freedom Fighters addressed some rather searching and embarrassing questions to me. They all thanked me and the American people for our generous relief supplies and offers of asylum in the United States. But they quickly added that while they were all grateful for the kindness shown to them what of those left behind in Hungary? Their own future was of little consequence—just what, they wanted to know, was the free world and particularly America going to do to help those still under the iron heel of the Soviets? I must admit that I had no ready answer. Besides it is a question that all of us must answer.

Don't offer these heroic people empty platitudes and meaningless phrases hoping for the best. We had better start doing some serious thinking about the full implications posed by the Hungarian uprising. And our heavily overstaffed and top-heavy State Department had better start doing some serious planning for future freedom explosions behind the Iron Curtain. I am sure that the new Congress convening in January will do some serious studying of budgets offered by the administration for Voice of America and other multi-million dollar programs ostensibly set up and maintained "to keep alive the spark of freedom in Soviet satellites and to assure enslaved peoples that we have not forgotten or abandoned them." These are fine words but they ring awfully hollow and empty right now. A Soviet-enslaved people did arise, they threw off their chains alone and unaided, and we were caught completely flat-footed and befuddled without a plan or course of action.

What can we do about all this? Can we do anything? This brings me to the crux of the whole Soviet problem. With very few exceptions the West has followed a policy of retreat and appeasement—appeasement and retreat. Plus endless talk-fests, conferences "at the summit," etc., etc.

At every showdown we always seem to be offered the same bitter Hobson's choice—further mollification and retreat or world war III with all the horrors of a nuclear weapons war. For some unexplained reason, Russia's rules do not seem to be afraid of stumbling into war—at least they never make any concessions in the interest of world peace. Frankly, I think a gigantic swindle has been perpetrated on the American people.

Time and time again we have reluctantly surrendered moral principles and backed down before some new Soviet act of aggression "lest we provoke the Soviets into war." Let me destroy this pernicious fallacy once and for all time. If Soviet Russia were ready for or wanted war with the United States it would not patiently wait year after year for a pretext or excuse. It would strike treacherously in the dead of night and think up an excuse or justification later.

What should we do about Hungary short of risking armed conflict? Very simple. Enforce the United Nations resolution demanding the withdrawal of all Soviet forces from Hungary. If the Soviets fail to comply in

a reasonable length of time we break off diplomatic relations on the humanitarian grounds that we will not exchange diplomatic niceties with brutalitarian regimes. The same, of course, applies to the six Communists who presently call themselves the Government of Hungary. The State Department's discontinuance of cultural exchanges with the Soviets is commendable but does not go far enough. Culture means nothing to barbarians but economic and political action does.

Can anyone in the State Department give me a good reason why we should maintain diplomatic relations with mass murderers? When a military junta, in a bloodless revolution, overthrows some legitimate government in Latin America it is established State Department policy to withhold recognition for a long time. We do this for the practical reason to see if the new regime can maintain itself in power and on the sound, moral principle that to grant instant recognition is to invite more of such military adventures against established law and order.

We have steadfastly refused to recognize the Red gangsters now in control of unfortunate China. Is there anyone seriously prepared to argue that Soviet Russia is governed by a more decent and human regime than Red China? Is there any discernible difference between the two? To me, and I am sure to most Americans, it seems rather plain if the Soviets deserve the status of moral equals and diplomatic equality then so does Red China. If Red China, the disciple, has put herself outside of the pale of humanity and is unacceptable in the family of nations then surely her Soviet mentors have even less right to sit beside us with the blood of free men still on their hands.

So it seems fitting to me that in commemorating the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights that we Americans not only pay tribute to the gallant Hungarian people in their terrible hour of martyrdom for freedom but that all of us do something practical now for their immediate liberation and relief of their suffering and misery. To the end that the Hungarian uprising will mark a definite turning point in history. That from the agony and bloodshed of this tortured nation the whole free world will become imbued with that spirit of the crusaders and begin at long last the grand offensive against that malignant and consummate evil, world communism. An offensive on every plane except the military—moral, religious, political, economic, and cultural.

Zanesville: All-America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the city of Zanesville in Muskingum County, located in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio, has received nationwide recognition for civil achievement as an All-America City selected by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. The naming of Zanesville is included in the January 22 edition of Look magazine which is available throughout the country tomorrow.

It is highly significant that Zanesville is the only city in the State of Ohio which has been selected for this honor this year

and is one of only 11 cities throughout the Nation which have been so honored. I should like also to point out proudly that this is the second city in the 15th district in the past 2 years which has been so honored. Last year my hometown city of Cambridge, Ohio, was accorded this recognition and honor and it is a tremendous compliment to my district that the neighboring city of Zanesville, Ohio, should be honored this year.

This is recognition of the new spirit of dynamism which has developed in southeastern Ohio. There local programs are being attacked aggressively and with imaginative force. The results of these efforts are now becoming apparent in the improvement of civic, social, and economic conditions.

I have watched the city of Zanesville deal with a great number of problems throughout the years. I have seen it succeed in meeting seemingly insurmountable obstacles which stood in the way of progress and growth. The people of that community are hard-working, determined people. The merchants and the industries of Zanesville have put forth a cooperative effort to achieve success in creating a prosperous and better community. Recognition of this fine cooperative effort by the award of All-America City to Zanesville, Ohio, is justly earned, richly deserved, and the people of the community are to be congratulated. Zanesville now stands as an example to other communities throughout the Nation.

Salary Increases for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill which provides for an increase in the rates of basic compensation for postal workers. I believe that the rates of compensation advocated in my bill are more realistic in the light of the current high cost of living.

When Congress enacted Public Law 68 back in 1955, postal employees were well aware of the inadequacies of that law, but most particularly were they aware of the fact that the salary increase it provided was too low. The simple truth is that the pay increases granted to our postal workers in recent years have not kept pace with the steady upward movement of the cost of living, which by the end of 1956 had reached its highest level.

In many instances it was found that the wage scale for postal workers is lower than the scale paid to unskilled laborers in private industry. In 1939 the average weekly wage for all factory workers was \$23.86, while the entrance salary for postal workers at that time was \$30.76. At the present time the average weekly wage for factory workers is \$82, but the entrance salary for letter carriers and

postal clerks is only \$70.36. This is a substantial difference.

Under these circumstances, the Post Office Department is having much difficulty in recruiting competent employees for its service. The present low entrance salaries are no inducement for a family man to want to make a career in the postal service when he can earn more in private industry and provide his family with a better standard of living.

In order to augment their earnings, it has become customary for many postal workers in recent years to take on a second job or to encourage their wives to seek employment. Many employees, particularly those in the lower-income brackets, find this situation intolerable as they struggle to maintain their family, the upkeep of the household, and the education of their children.

In an article published in the U. S. News & World Report, in the issue of August 3, 1956, it is shown that of some 34 different working groups in the country, Federal employees are listed at the very bottom as having secured only a 14-percent increase in their effective pay rate since 1939.

In my bill it is provided that the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, known as Public Law 68, be amended by setting up a field-service schedule with entrance salaries between \$4,645 to \$5,170, and that the present steps be reduced from 7 to 4. When we consider the fact the average income of all American families in 1955 was estimated at \$5,519 and that for 1957 the average income is estimated to reach \$6,063, then the salaries proposed in my bill are fair and most reasonable.

I am firmly convinced that the proposed pay increases for postal workers would be used largely for meeting normal family needs rather than for luxuries. Adequate pay increases for these people are long overdue. I believe that Congress should grant them a substantial pay increase and thus afford them the fullest opportunity to maintain a decent standard of living commensurate with the rest of the country.

Los Angeles Times 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on December 4 I had the privilege of attending a luncheon celebrating the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Los Angeles Times under the auspices of the Los Angeles Advertising Club at the Ambassador Hotel at Los Angeles.

Among the nearly 1,000 persons attending were civic and political leaders of the present and the past. The principal speaker was Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, who spoke as the United States delegate to the United Nations, having flown from New York City to Los Angeles to attend this affair.

Senator KNOWLAND's remarks were characteristic of his firm stand for a sound, strong, positive foreign policy and a denunciation of the Soviet Union's atrocious attack on the patriots of Hungary who revolted for freedom and liberty in their native land.

One of the features of this meeting was the introduction of Norman Chandler, the present publisher of the Los Angeles Times, who succeeded his father, Harry Chandler, to this position, and Norman Chandler's introduction of his brothers and his son, Otis Chandler, a third generation of the Chandler family, who is learning the newspaper business from the bottom, and is at present employed in the circulation department of the Los Angeles Times.

The Los Angeles Times is among the greatest newspapers of the United States which has grown with Los Angeles and through its policies has helped Los Angeles expand and grow into one of the great cities of the world.

At this meeting a booklet entitled "History in Headlines" was distributed to all present which contained the front page of the Los Angeles Times from its first edition on December 4, 1881, up to the edition of November 7, 1956. In reading this interesting volume, the history of Los Angeles and the history of international and national events in the Nation are recorded.

In the 7½ decades that this great newspaper has been published, many stirring events have occurred, in war and peace, in economic expansion, in population increase, and the Los Angeles Times has grown in prestige and importance during that time together with the great city of Los Angeles.

From its beginning on December 4, 1881, up to its 75th anniversary on December 4, 1956, the following is a brief recorded history of each 10-year period:

THE VIGOROUS DECADES, 1881-99

In 1881 Los Angeles—a town of 11,000—gave first evidence of the growth and vitality that was to make it a metropolis of the first rank. In this vigorous era, the Los Angeles Times was born—a fledgling newspaper that caught the spirit of the community and gave quick evidence, by its enthusiasm and growth, of the role it was to play in the development of the area. Locally, the eighties and the nineties saw the first big wave of immigration, the real-estate boom, the beginnings of the great petroleum and agriculture industries, the struggle for the free harbor, that are still so important to the economy of this area.

THE TURN OF THE CENTURY, 1900-10

In 20 years, Los Angeles had increased its population more than ninefold and by 1900 numbered 102,479 persons. The decade of the 1900's saw the rapid development of interurban transportation lines that made the city the capital of a vast suburban empire. Two important events passed almost unnoticed—behind a Chinese laundry, a motion picture was filmed, the first in Los Angeles; in a Santa Ana church, a flying machine was built, the first in the world to take off under its own power.

CRUSADES, LOCAL AND WORLDWIDE, 1910-19

The decade of 1910-19 began with a great surge of growth in Los Angeles—the completion of the harbor breakwater for which the Times had fought; the Owens Valley aqueduct, another Times crusade; a great interest in aviation; the rise of giant oil industry; and the establishment of the southland's first truck-manufacturing concern. Motion pictures were booming. Then came the war with its Liberty Loans, conscription, shortages, and economic disruption. Civic progress was shelved for grimmer business.

THOSE ROARING TWENTIES, 1920-29

In Los Angeles, as throughout the country, the twenties were an amazing era. Here there were booms of all kinds—real-estate booms, oil-drilling booms, oil-stock booms, and rapid business expansions. County population soared from 936,000 to 2,208,000 in 10 years. The harbor was greatly enlarged. Hollywood stumbled temporarily at the impact of talking pictures and then the whole economy was brought up short by "black Tuesday," October 29, 1929.

THE BUSY THIRTIES, 1930-39

Bright spot of the thirties in Los Angeles was the Olympic games—tremendously successful and prestige building. This was the decade of public works with a shift into rapid industrial expansion stimulated by the threats of war from abroad. It experienced a great wave of immigration by drought-stricken farmers and indigent families. Some of these later returned where they came from, some kept moving, many remained to man the assembly lines of factories turning out the materials of war and became important factors in the area's economic growth.

THE WAR HITS HOME, 1940-49

Of all major American cities, Los Angeles came closest to knowing the physical impact of war, first when enemy submarines cruised its shores and shelled oilfields to the north, then when an air raid alarm seemed uncomfortably genuine. The arsenals of war worked round the clock and industrial production soared to record heights. Yet the coming of peace brought little economic dislocation as factories shifted smoothly from war to peacetime production—proof of the diversity of manufacture underlying the prosperity of the area.

THIRD LARGEST CITY IN THE NATION, 1950-56

The quiet pueblo of 1881 has become the third largest city in the Nation. To accommodate its new citizens, it has built more than 97,000 new homes every year this decade. Statistics tell the story of Los Angeles today. With a population of 2,278,000 it is the third city of the Nation. It ranks third also in manufacturing, buying income, and retail sales. The Times which has served it for 75 years has kept pace—the Times today leads all newspapers in the United States in volume of news content and in advertising linage; and stands first in the West in circulation.

May it be many more decades before "30" is written on the Los Angeles Times.

The "Big Stick" Declaration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower-Dulles Middle East policy will be a stabilizing influence in that troubled and highly sensitive area. If the pronouncement had come from the head of a government that could not fulfill such a mammoth undertaking, the effect would be meaningless. The United States is the acknowledged leader of the world free forces. The effect of the "Eisenhower doctrine" will be that aggressive aims or moves in that part of the world will be deterred. A crystallized policy on the part of the Government and people of the United States is timely, in order, and overdue.

Congress will approve the recommendations, but not without full hearings and adequate debate. The House will act with dispatch. The Senate will require considerably more time in its discussions. In the end, a resounding and topheavy majority will approve use of armed forces should one of the Middle Eastern nations be attacked by a Communist aggressor. The one-package resolution will include a proposal for economic aid to alleviate poverty, suffering, offer employment, and provide needed power for accelerating industrial development.

Communism thrives on distress, hunger, and poverty. The British had aided many of the countries before withdrawing its forces. With the closing of the Suez Canal and the sabotaging of oil pipelines, the economy of the area has suffered extremely and, as a result, new problems have been created.

During the campaign of 1956 the President emphasized an effective slogan, "peace and prosperity." The "big-stick" pronouncement—coming so soon after the election—was a shock to many of his supporters, as well as a large number of those who opposed him. The administration's action in opposing the recent Anglo-French moves in the Suez Canal zone had the United States pictured as being for "peace at any price." The President's unprecedented appearance before the joint session of Congress prior to delivering the state-of-the-Union message quelled those rumors. The remarks of Mr. Eisenhower left no doubt in the mind of anyone that America will not stand idly by should Russia attack a Middle Eastern nation.

The trouble in the Suez and adjacent territory was fomented in 1955 when the Kremlin decided to move into the area through economic and military aid, subversion, or other means.

After World War I, we allowed our military forces to become impotent. As a result of such policy, Germany invaded the low countries and Japan attacked our fleet at Pearl Harbor. Fortunately, we had time to train and equip our armed might, but the war was long and costly in the loss of our manpower and in dollars.

After World War II, we fell back once again into the doldrum of complacency. Then trouble broke out in the Far East. The situation is different today. The President's words should carry with them real respect throughout the world. The only respect the Communists appreciate is armed might.

The Rural Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the things that are being done in the 15th District of Ohio with regard to the low-income farm families and the low-income farm problems that we have there.

Southeastern Ohio is hilly, in many places wooded, and the farms, though some of them are very fertile, are small, cut up and diversified. Ask almost any farmer in the seven counties of southeastern Ohio what kind of a farm he has, or what type farming he does and he will explain that he has a small farm and is engaged in general farming. By general farming, he means that he is growing those things to which his land is adapted. He follows a system of rotation of crops. He has several acres of corn, some oats, a few acres of wheat. He has some meadow and pastureland. He has cattle, some sheep, some pigs, and his wife looks after some chickens. There is usually a portion of his farm that is in woodland or is a nonproductive area which should be in woodland. In many cases, his income is the barest minimum sufficient to support him and his wife and his family. Many times he finds it not only convenient, but very necessary to work off the farm, for his neighbors, or to take a job in town as a factory worker or a clerk in a store. Very few of the farmers in the hill regions of southeastern Ohio might be called prosperous.

For this reason, among others, two of the counties of southeastern Ohio were selected and designated as "pilot counties." This is a part of the rural development program advocated by President Eisenhower and directed by the Department of Agriculture in an effort to meet the economic inequities which exist between such farm families and citizens who are engaged in other pursuits.

Of course equality could be obtained and the inequities erased, insofar as income is concerned, by a handout from the Federal Government. It would be possible to assure a kind of false prosperity for all farmers, either by handing them money or by guaranteeing them artificially high prices for the products which they grow. Such a program—and we have come dangerously close to pursuing a program of that sort—would re-

sult in great expense on the part of the Federal Government, and would create an attitude on the part of the recipients which would do anything but inspire ambition and desire to succeed. American farmers are made of something more sturdy than that. They do not want handouts. They have traditionally been the business pioneers and examples of industry and hard work in this Nation. It is true that they have reached a point where they are no longer sharing in as large a proportion in the prosperity of this Nation as are other segments of the population.

The rural-development program is one which is designed to improve the farmer's plight by showing him how to do things better and, where necessary, by offering him assistance to operate his farm in a more economic fashion. It also is designed to bring into play all other segments of the population in a cooperative effort to make agriculture and the agricultural industry a more profitable field of endeavor. Not only the Department of Agriculture but all other departments of the Federal Government, State agencies and local government are called into cooperative action. The two phases of the program are diagnosis and treatment. At this time, the program is not being attempted on a nationwide scale but only in those areas which have been determined to be in greatest need, and where there are present local attitudes and desires to improve the situation as it exists. These counties are the so-called pilot counties. They are comparable to an experimental laboratory or a pilot plant. Diagnosis is made of the difficulties and problems which exist and then machinery is set in motion in an effort to treat those ills.

I have watched with interest the beginnings of the program in Monroe County and Guernsey County, both of them in Ohio's 15th District. The local minds and facilities are set into organized motion to learn what is wrong with agriculture in those particular communities and, secondly, to determine what steps are best for the treatment of it. I have attended some of the organization meetings and beginnings of the rural-development program in those counties in my district and I have watched the local people sit down together, and begin the process of cooperation to pave the way for a successful program. I am confident that there is sufficient determination on the part of the communities in those two counties to improve, not only the agricultural conditions, but, inasmuch as agriculture is the backbone of our Nation, to improve many other conditions as well. The assistance of know-how and show-how, which the Federal Government can throw into gear will bring about a new day for Monroe and Guernsey Counties.

And, Mr. Speaker, here is the most important phase of the rural development program: Inasmuch as its success in these two counties will come, not from the mere fact of handing money to a segment of population which is less prosperous than another, but will come from developing a program with concrete objectives, the lessons learned in Monroe

County and in Guernsey County can then be applied in the other counties of the State and of our Nation. I would like to urge that the 85th Congress give very serious consideration to this most economical of all expenditures of Federal funds for the benefit of agriculture—the rural development program. The Congress needs to expand this program. It will be money well spent and result in more prosperous times for all of our small-scale, family farmers.

The 561st Air Force Band, California Air National Guard, Participated in Inaugural Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the brightest features of the inaugural parade and the most welcome to a Californian was the appearance of the California Air National Guard of the United States, represented by an outstanding band from my district.

The 561st Air Force Band at the California Air National Guard, based at Hayward, was flown from the Oakland International Airport via a Western Air Defense Command C-119 to represent California in the inaugural parade.

Despite the unaccustomed low temperatures, the bandsmen were among the few service bands which marched without overcoats, showing off to advantage their striking uniforms.

Those uniforms were provided in large part from proceeds of tickets bought by appreciative citizens of the area who have so greatly enjoyed the band's annual variety shows in the Oakland auditorium, an event which yearly draws large audiences.

Cheers greeted the smart appearance and precision of the California Air National Guard men, and there was solid applause for the musical selections, each of which was introduced with a special arrangement of a few bars of California. Here I Come. Capital musicians joined with the throngs in rating that music among the very best.

Following are the names and addresses of band members:

C. W. O. John D. Schary, 1647 Oakview, Berkeley, Calif.

M. Sgt. Ernest S. Baptista, 746 Elsie Avenue, San Leandro, Calif.

M. Sgt. Eugene Rolandelli, Jr., 24524 Broadmore Avenue, Hayward, Calif.

T. Sgt. Arthur M. Hamilton, 3922 Ardley Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

S. Sgt. James W. Halford, 1045 Cecilia Court, San Leandro, Calif.

S. Sgt. Clarence W. Mehrwein, Jr., 3588 Harper Street, Oakland, Calif.

S. Sgt. Bill L. Owens, 1430 Second Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

S. Sgt. William A. Pacheco, 118 Via Buena Vista, San Lorenzo, Calif.

S. Sgt. Clyde B. Pound, 2439 68th Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

S. Sgt. Michael E. Starr, 1452 Bay Street, Alameda, Calif.

A1c. Jack J. Beecher, 372 San Francisco Boulevard, Sharp Park, Calif.

A1c. Sidney R. Bergquist, 2328 Channing Way, Berkeley, Calif.

A1c. John L. Lambert, Jr., 325 Garnet Street, Oakland, Calif.

A1c. Donald I. Madera, 1951 Foothill Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

A1c. Wilbert L. Thomas, 3045 Texas Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

A2c. Richard S. Adams, 1815 Curtis Street, Berkeley, Calif.

A2c. Charles L. Cunningham, 527 Superior Avenue, San Leandro, Calif.

A2c. Matthew T. DiMercurio, 3620 Concord Boulevard, Concord, Calif.

A2c. Robert M. Giambruno, 7941 Arthur Street, Oakland, Calif.

A2c. Jerry D. Michael, 1701 Springbrook Road, Walnut Creek, Calif.

A2c. Royce A. Noe, 1915 89th Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

A2c. Stephen C. Oswald, 1985 Grove Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A2c. Kow Takemoto, 1 Candlestick Road, San Francisco, Calif.

A3c. Fred W. Cochran, Jr., 73 Carlos Court, Walnut Creek, Calif.

A3c. Morris E. Grossman, 276 Bristol Boulevard, San Leandro, Calif.

A3c. Thomas A. Hannen, 5409 Thomas Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

A3c. Albert L. Keehn, 3001 Madeline Street, Oakland, Calif.

A3c. Terry L. Summa, 1142 College Avenue, Alameda, Calif.

A3c. Robert G. Wallin, 828 Mandana Boulevard, Oakland, Calif.

AB. Donald W. Beckie, 317 Central Avenue, Alameda, Calif.

AB. Phillip R. Lemos, 3426 Mount Diablo Boulevard, Lafayette, Calif.

A1c. Norman E. Hibbard, 348 South 11th Street, San Jose, Calif.

A2c. Norman J. Owen, 1420 Finley Lane, Walnut Creek, Calif.

AB. Robert C. Reeves, 1529 Everett Street, Alameda, Calif.

Retirement of Federal Employees After 30 Years' Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which provides for the retirement of Federal employees on full annuities after they have completed 30 years of service. This bill has the support of responsible Government employees' organizations.

Specifically, my bill would permit all Government employees optional retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act after 30 years of service, regardless of the employee's age and without reduction in annuities because of a person's early retirement.

Under provisions of the act at the present time, Government employees who have completed 30 years of service are permitted optional retirement with full annuity when they reach the age of 60, or with reduced annuity at the age of 55. Annuities are not provided at ages below 55, regardless of an employee's length of Federal service, except in certain cases of disability or other special circumstances.

I feel that retirement upon the completion of 30 years of Government service, on full annuity and without regard to a person's age, would serve as a great boost to the morale of all those now in the Federal employ. Furthermore, it would also attract many able people toward a career in Government and it would encourage others now in the service who may contemplate leaving because of inadequate salary or insufficient retirement benefits.

Mr. Speaker, Federal employees are a most loyal, hard-working, and conscientious group. They deserve adequate recognition for the valuable services they perform for this Nation, and they also deserve adequate retirement benefits after they have completed their terms of public service. For this reason, I believe that early and serious consideration should be given to the measure I have just introduced.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, the flag of the Ukraine will be raised over the city hall in Passaic, N. J., a brave, bright symbol of that nation's short-lived independence and the burning determination of her people once again to be free.

To all who will see that flag flying there against the free American sky, the tragic plight of the sons and daughters of the Ukraine and all the enslaved nations within the orbit of Communist domination will be dramatically brought home. It will give heart to those now feeling the pain of wounds laid bare in the recent revolts of Hungary and Poland, and will awaken memories of other smaller but no less inspiring uprisings in the slave-labor camps of Europe and Central Asia and in Germany's Communist-ruled Eastern Zone. It will hurl to the skies the challenge that those who stand for freedom stand not alone, and its rippling folds will whisper to the breeze that those who fell have not been forgotten.

As the people of Passaic, N. J., mark the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, so all America will remember and pledge anew sympathy and support for those who remain enslaved.

The road to freedom is no easy path; and, although the recent incredible heroism of the Freedom Fighters has torn a rent in the Iron Curtain, its complete

obliteration presents a Herculean but not insurmountable task. It is a road that must be trod with caution as well as courage and determination, lest the entire world be plunged into cataclysmic destruction. As President Eisenhower has so effectively put it:

The building of such a peace is a bold and solemn purpose . . . to attain it we must be aware of its full meaning . . . and ready to pay its full price.

But, as surely as sunrise follows darkness, the dawn of freedom must return to the brave people of the Ukraine, of Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, and all the rest. For freedom is the divinely endowed birthright of all men, and no tyranny shall ever permanently destroy this heritage.

Aspinall States the Issues on Reclamation and Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, made an outstanding speech at the National Reclamation Association annual convention in Salt Lake City on November 16, 1956.

He clearly and forcefully set forth the main issues on national reclamation policy and discussed those issues with clarity and good sense. I think our colleagues will be interested in the speech on this important subject and, therefore, ask permission to include it at this point in the RECORD.

COOPERATION IN RECLAMATION, BY HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, OF COLORADO, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen, once again it is a happy and pleasing experience for me to be here with the members and guests of the National Reclamation Association. A part of this pleasure, I fear, comes from some personal surprise. I thought it an honor to address this group last year. But, I must confess that only in being asked back a second time do I properly appreciate the honor.

In thinking on what I might say to the many specialists of the water and water conservation and development field who are here, I could not help but wonder about the impact of what I said last year. Did I say so little that you assumed I might do better, or did I say something of such value that it demands a second treatment? Whatever the reason, I am pleased to be here because this field—the use of our most precious of all resources—is one close to my heart. I know that it is a subject of daily importance to all of you. For most of you, it is also the field of your labor, either in the dedication of your spare time—and by that we understand clearly that we mean time you cannot easily spare—or in your employment. This association has rendered a great service to water conservation and development in the years of its life. We are all aware, I am sure, that it must meet

greater demands in the future. It is of these demands that I propose to speak today.

It is a valuable axiom of the physical sciences that for each force in one direction, there is an equal and opposite force. It is on this principle that the outrush of hot gases from the turbine pushes the jet forward at speeds almost beyond comprehension—faster than the fired bullets from its own guns. We tend to forget, I think, that something of this same principle spills over into the field of the arts of man and that governing and government is an art of man.

What has this to do with water, with reclamation, with this great body of believers, the National Reclamation Association? Just this. The success of the reclamation program in the past tends to create two opposing forces, one toward advances in the future, and the other toward opposition that might sound its death knell.

We cannot rest upon our efforts of yesterday. I know that none here plan to do so, but are we ready for the opposition we must meet tomorrow?

Last year in my talk, I tried to give a short review of the reclamation program, what brought it into being, how it developed, how early problems were overcome, and where we stood at that time. As best I can today digest that address into a sentence or so, it is this: The Federal reclamation program began at the turn of the century as a natural and necessary outgrowth of the land disposal and development programs of the Nation. It grew slowly at first, but did much to settle the dry West. With the utilization of the multiple-purpose concept, it took new strides forward, yet met new opposition at almost every turn. The power end of multiple-purpose projects, for a time, seemed about to gobble up reclamation of which it, power, was but a creature. Federally produced power, accordingly, became a matter of great controversy. This remains at the present even though our sights are more clearly on our primary goal which is land settlement and development, and use and conservation of water in an arid or semiarid region.

In the year that has passed since I spoke to you, giant steps have been taken in the reclamation field. I take some personal pride in these great steps, not because I think that I am responsible to any appreciable degree, but rather because I was in a position to see the changing tide of battle as the lines formed and broke, reformed, and finally made the telling charge to victory. For me, it has been a great and rewarding experience to serve as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation and to sponsor some, and labor in the passage of other, great pieces of legislation. It has been a rewarding experience to work with my chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, of California, and his counterpart across the aisle, the Honorable A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska. I cannot here list all the names of all of those who fought in these battles, but many of the patriots are here today. I miss, and we shall all miss in the years to come, the counsel and aid of our good friend, Senator Gene Millikin, of Colorado. It grieved me that we did not agree on some programs, such as Hells Canyon, but Senator Millikin was a tower of strength in the Senate and his talents will be sorely missed. I wish each man could be recognized, but I know that their names are known and appreciated by this audience.

What was achieved? First and foremost, the reclamation program was rescued from the doldrums and reestablished as an important objective of the Federal Government.

When the last Congress began its labor, great debate was raging over the reclamation program. From the administration had come a new viewpoint on water policy. The so-called new partnership program had been proposed. It was being argued and debated. Into this debate, the long-established foes

of reclamation rushed with glee—they were happy to fish in these troubled waters. As a consequence of this debate, of a shift of attitude on the part of the administration, of the increased opportunity of opponents to sow doubt and discord, reclamation had been badly mangled. Expenditures which had reached \$367 million in 1950 had dropped to less than \$150 million by 1954. The big factor, and it a part of the lack of executive push, was the absence of new authorized projects. The 82d Congress approved but one project, and the 83d authorized only a few small projects totaling about \$56 million in estimated cost.

Into this sea of uncertainty and strife, the 84th Congress pushed with vigor. For the most part, it ignored the debate on the so-called partnership program and pursued instead the tried and true of past policy. Thirty-five pieces of reclamation legislation were enacted into law in the most dramatic demonstration of faith in reclamation since its founding. Total new authorizations of about \$1.16 billion were pushed into law. Largest of these authorizations was the \$760 million upper Colorado storage and development program—a program to insure to the four upper-basin States of the Colorado River the use of their water in the development of their land and other resources. Other significant projects were approved, including the Trinity in California, the Washoe in California and Nevada, the Ventura in California, the Crooked River in Oregon, the Little Wood River in Idaho, the Washita in Oklahoma, and others.

We are not proud of this record for the sake of a record. We are proud of it because we know that it is a contribution to the future strength and well-being of the areas affected and the Nation as a whole. Construction of these projects will bring under irrigation about 471,000 acres of new land and provide supplemental water to an additional 805,000 acres. Some 1.5 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power capacity, generating some 6.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power annually, will come on the line. Other values, including domestic water, flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation, will be served. These values would be enough for the Nation even if repayment of construction costs were not provided. And much of the repayment will be with interest. Reclamation has been reestablished. Now we must make sure that we sustain these projects and that money for their actual construction is forthcoming as necessary.

Second in importance, and may I say to many even first in importance, was the passage of the Small Projects Act. Legislation of this concept had been before the Congress for a number of years. This association and its leadership looms large in the development of this program and in its passage. This addition to traditional policy can take care of projects too large for individuals or associations on a private basis, but which can be accomplished by local water users' organizations with some financial assistance from the Federal Government. This legislation establishes simplified planning, review, and authorization procedures for sound but small projects, and provides financial assistance in the form of interest-free loans for irrigation and grants covering national benefits such as flood control. It will encourage the traditional participation by local organizations and the States. The law carries the limitation that full reimbursement costs must be repaid in 50 years, and this will limit the number of feasible projects. However, it will be of great value in rehabilitation and betterment, or extension of existing projects.

We now have the soil-conservation program, which does much to take care of soil-and-water conservation on individual farms. We now have the Water Facilities Act of the Farmers Home Administration providing benefits for small individual or associated water projects. Next in line comes the Small

Projects Act and its blood cousin, the Small Watersheds Act. Beyond that, we have the regular reclamation program of the Department of the Interior. With these programs, an energetic and sympathetic administration, and traditional cooperation, the West, and the Nation, for that matter, should now be able to meet its water and resource development needs.

I confess that I have skipped rapidly over a vast territory. Most of you here will know the great obstacles that were met and overcome in each of these programs. In some, we had strong support from the administration, but in others we had disinterest, and in other cases, opposition. Each was strongly opposed by the usual phalanx of antireclamationists. We had, additionally, opposition to some of these programs from within what has always been the reclamation family. We had the problem of those who were concerned that these programs would add to our farm problem and to our surpluses in that field. Still—I wish to say here and now that the greatest opposition which we had can be laid to the debate which raged in and around the new partnership presentation of the administration. I do not say that the idea of true and equitable partnership has given us any trouble. Far from it. Partnership as such has been traditional with the reclamation program from its very beginning.

What has caused much grief is a new tack in water policy which passes under the banner of partnership. I refer to it as a banner or slogan, because we who are here today know that we have had cooperation, participation, joint local-State-National effort in reclamation for a long, long time.

Having plunged into the icy waters of controversy, I proceed. However, as I assume the position of critic, let me first give well-deserved credit to the present executive department in the aid and cooperation to the success which we had. I would not accept the responsibility of critic at this time if I did not think of water as our most precious resource. I assure all of you that I have no partisan ax to grind. Reclamation and water development has been one of our most treasured bipartisan programs in the West. We have all always tended to believe in, and give support to, Federal assistance for resource development. I believe that we have no alternative. I believe with equal firmness, however, that the pressure for partnership, as it is interpreted in its extreme by the present administration, has done great damage to western development. If pursued as an established policy, and I remind you that it is not yet established policy, I see only trouble ahead for all of us.

The greatest impact of the new policy presentation of the administration is that it is not partnership but rather partitionship. It does not operate to bring groups together, as I conceive partnership, but rather to partition a program into several separate interests. It does not bring together those having a community of interest; rather it divides them into competing groups. It stifles a common goal.

I do not think that this splintering is the unintended result of a possible program. It is the result of the very concept itself. I am convinced, in fact, that this very splintering was well understood by those who put this concept together, and that this splintering was one of the major purposes of the new look.

The first question that came to me, and it took a long time for me to find an answer since I was working hard to move legislation along a tried and proven pathway, the first question about this policy was: Why was it necessary at all? What has been wrong with our water-development policy that necessitates a change? I could find no answer that satisfied me. I have yet to find one that justifies the damage done. I'll grant that the new proposal achieves rather quickly an apparent decrease in governmental out-

lay—but are we to measure the success of a monumental program merely by how cheap it is in today's budget? Are we to ignore recognized and proven measurable returns? I think not. The Nation's budget is far more than this year's figures of income and outgo. It is also an accounting of the Nation's investment in itself. Cheap investment is likely to bring cheap results. Miserly appropriations will bring miserly results, and if some other agency is to make up the funds, what have we saved in the Nation's budget? Precisely nothing, since the cost must still be met and must still be paid by the users of the services provided. The new argument, if appealing, is specious. Something more solid is needed because it manifestly saves no money to the users or consumers. Indeed, the most casual analysis of cost to the users of projects under the so-called new partnership program reveals that costs to them are greater. Even worse, not only are out-of-pocket costs greater for services provided, especially power, but the loss of resource potential is a cost that has not yet been calculated, nor has the cost of providing necessary national facilities at alternative sites been considered.

It is stated that this program will give us more development of our resources since it will not need to depend upon uncertain Federal appropriations. And how does this assertion square with the facts? We have had less, not more, development. The most conspicuous example that we have today of this new policy approach is the Hells Canyon controversy. Apparently such project is to be developed by private interests without outlay by the Federal Government. Thus, we, as a Nation, are supposed to have gained. Unfortunately, we have not gained and, on the contrary, we have lost and I mean that all of us have lost.

We have lost part of the immediate powerhead, even if the three-dam plan is followed and the consensus seems to be that it will not be followed. Worse, we have lost valuable upstream storage for downstream power production and thereby, a further loss of power is to be noted. Beyond that, we have lost valuable flood storage; and, that has a value which depends upon the vagaries of nature. We have lost also potential reclamation development on lands that might have received financial assistance from the high dam. Also, by this change in emphasis and direction, it will be harder now to obtain necessary headwater storage on the Snake for existing uses. Finally, by this shift of program, we have dealt a body blow to the maximum and comprehensive development of the Columbia Basin—the greatest power storehouse left in the Nation. If I had partners like that, I would get out of such partnership with all possible speed.

Speaking now as a lawyer, the so-called partnership program reminds me of a bitterly contested estate matter where one ends up with someone sawing a house in half, although the sawing in this case has been into more pieces. This great policy pronouncement has been an unwise and unnecessary intrusion of private interests into public policy. It has, as it was apparently designed to do, operated to the benefit of a few who will now be able to lay tribute upon public waters converted to private use. This is no way to develop our Nation's resources.

What was so wrong in the Northwest that we had to have a partitioning program offered? Nothing. Rather, it was a showplace of development, second only to the TVA area. Its very success, just as the success of the TVA had done, brought the upthrust of opposition which, with favorable political ground, was able to turn back the clock—clear back to the days before Teddy Roosevelt, Pinchot, and the elder Taft—back to the days when resources were considered mere prizes for the first favored individual to grab.

Policies initiated under former President Theodore Roosevelt and nurtured with bipartisan support over the dark years of contest between private spoliation and unified basinwide development, were thrown out in a moment in payment for services rendered in an election contest. The early leaders, and would that we had them back to retestify to their dreams, conceived of development as something which was to bring the greatest good to the greatest number and not the greatest profit to the more fortunate entrepreneur. Those earlier advocates of reclamation did not bother with specious arguments about public versus private, or local versus national. They did not waver before the stained flag of socialism. They believed in the comprehensive development of our Nation's rivers by the most practical plan, regardless of the name-calling by the opposition.

But, after these great battles for TVA, for the Hoover Dam and its related developments, for Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and for countless small projects scattered over the landscape of the Nation, we became terrified by scare words. It was discovered by the enemies of reclamation and conservation programs that people had no particular feeling one way or another about public power . . . but that they were quite naturally opposed to socialism. Suddenly, the developing hand of Uncle Sam was charged with being "Red"—it was socialism to harness our resources under a program big enough and grand enough to do the job. Now we are to partition this development in the name of private and local development and give it the soothing sobriquet of "partnership."

For all the shock job done to belittle and demean Federal development, it was not possible to make a frontal assault upon proved operations. One couldn't shoot the TVA or cleanse it directly in a bath of enterprise through sale, but someone could enter through the back door and institute a deal to break its back. Someone could starve its appropriations since that would make good political capital and help toward a balanced budget. Someone could do things more directly to the Bonneville Power Administration and it now limps along, a mere shadow of the dynamic organization which revitalized the Northwest and brought to it a power grid where each purchaser got his juice at the same price and a price low enough to open a virgin land. Now the backbone grid has osteomyelitis and it is getting homeopathic treatment—another dose of the same for the cure.

You may be saying to yourselves, well you shouldn't complain. The upper Colorado River project was carefully insulated from such assaults and was certified as pure and in the public interest for public development. Also, 35 pieces of nonpartitionship (as presently defined) legislation were passed and the future of reclamation looks rather bright as a consequence—so why complain?

Well, for many reasons. Primarily, the intended criticism, constructive I hope, is a deep and sincere objection to the promotion of a program which does damage to the best development of the Nation's resources. Falling water in Utah, or Colorado, or New Mexico, or Wyoming is not different politically or policywise from water falling in Oregon, Washington, or Idaho, or on the international border along the St. Lawrence. It should, in each place, be developed for the maximum good for the maximum number—and without knee-bending for egghead debate about what is socialism and what is not—or whether private or public agencies are pure enough to enter a river canyon at point A as opposed to point B.

In the Tennessee Valley we got an absolute basin program of development. Political overtones now appear to make impossible a basin-type authority anywhere else and as a consequence, it is all that much harder to get a basinwide organization with sufficient

efficiency, zeal, determination, and support to develop the area to its maximum. Why then add even more problems and institute a partitioning concept that splinters what little unity which is left. The only answer is that the splintering must be desired by some interest.

It is my understanding that this association over the years has favored unified basin-wide development without unnecessary concern for political overtones. I believe that it should emphatically reaffirm this goal and this philosophy. Partnership we have always had and private enterprise parts of the unified development program we have always had. What we need to do now is fight this divisive, partitioning aspect of a program which gives the revenues to private interests for piecemeal and partial development of a river or its basin and leaves to the public the expense of constructing nonrevenue facilities. We have learned already on the Columbia that this lately announced program of public responsibility and construction means construction on sites where the expense is greater and where the damage to other values, such as fish or wildlife or wilderness, is much more.

Those of you who have visited the Columbia Basin know firsthand what that long-planned development could have meant. You can also understand what it would be like if Grand Coulee had been built under the so-called partnership concept of the last several years. Where would all the farms be? How would the situation have been in the Central Valley of California; or for that matter, even at Hoover Dam?

We believe in unified basinwide development. We have ample evidence that these great programs have paid great dividends not only to the area of operation but to the whole Nation. Let us reaffirm our support here and now for such programs which have brought to the Nation great successful achievements such as the Central Valley in California, the Hoover Dam complex, the partially developed Columbia Basin, and the presently authorized upper Colorado project.

Tax Relief for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 7, 1957

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced today a bill designed to give needed tax relief to small busi-

nesses. This bill, which I introduced originally during the 84th Congress, first of all, reduces the present normal corporate tax rate from 30 percent to 22 percent. This normal tax is applicable to all taxable income of the corporation. The bill also provides that a surtax rate of 32 percent be applicable to all taxable income over \$50,000, a matter of considerable importance to small businesses. Under present law the surtax rate is 22 percent and is applicable to quite small taxable income; it is charged against income over \$25,000.

When I introduced the original bill in 1955 I showed statistically that big business has been enjoying an appreciable increase in profits, whereas the profits of small business have declined considerably. I have also illustrated how small businesses are suffering from a high casualty rate, while the big corporations disappear only by merger to become even larger.

We have been experiencing recently a wave of mergers and business concentration which we can trace directly to our tax rates. This economic trend is incompatible with the American traditional concept of free enterprise upon which the foundations of our democracy rest. The danger from this has become so acute that the administration is belatedly sponsoring legislation of this sort together with antimerger amendments to the antitrust statutes.

Small corporations having assets less than \$250,000 have had a rate of profit for the years 1953 to 1955 only about one-fourth to one-half as high as enjoyed by corporations having assets over \$100 million. Without adequate earnings these small enterprises cannot survive. Furthermore, it would indeed be injudicious to hope that the high rate of bankruptcy of small businesses will be alleviated if we maintain the present stifling tax rates.

On May 31, 1956, President Eisenhower indicated the importance of the problems facing small business when he appointed a Cabinet Committee on Small Business which was charged with making recommendations to eliminate obstacles hindering the growth of small business. In its progress report in August of 1956 the committee recommended that the corporate normal income tax rate be re-

duced to 20 percent. The committee said that the tax reduction would help smaller firms to retain earnings for financing expansion and would generally encourage the formation of new businesses.

The combination of changes in this bill will give tax relief of not less than 26.7 percent to corporations earning less than \$75,000. Corporations earning between \$75,000 and \$525,000 will receive tax relief, but of a lower percentage; and corporations earning more than \$525,000 will pay slightly more tax.

Compared to the larger and better established corporations the small and new businesses have limited access to credit and equity capital from external sources. These small and new businesses must rely more heavily on internal funds, such as retained earnings, for financing expansion. Since, therefore, retained earnings are a more critical source of funds for financing expansion for small businesses than for larger companies, we can reasonably conclude that high corporate income taxes will restrict the growth of smaller firms more severely than that of larger corporations.

This bill reduces the tax rate which is applicable to all the net income of the small corporations, namely the normal tax rate. In the interest of maintaining Federal revenue at as high a level as possible and also of restoring a competitive position to small business, my bill provides that the surtax rate, which will apply to taxable income over \$50,000, be raised by 10 percentage points. It must be pointed out that according to Treasury revenue estimates that this balancing of the tax reduction for small business, with a slight tax raise for the very large corporations, will hold Treasury income from corporate rates very near present levels or at only a very slight loss which can be recouped through closing of some small loopholes.

In view of the present plight of small and new business, the expressed desires of President Eisenhower to improve the competitive position of small business for the good of the economy, and the recent recommendation of the Cabinet Committee on Small Business to reduce the tax load of these small businesses, what better course of legislative action can we take than to adopt a sound tax proposal such as my bill contains?

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1957

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Robert J. McEwen, S. J., of Boston College, Newton, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost:

Almighty and eternal God, the Creator and common Father of all men and all nations, in whose eyes we are all brothers, and by whose blood we are all redeemed, deign to pursue and bless the

efforts of our President and our legislators to achieve peace without sacrifice of honor or dignity or moral principle; aid them to exercise world leadership commensurate with the wealth of natural and human resources with which Thy bounty has blessed this Nation of ours; guide and strengthen the will of each individual Member of this august deliberative body so that no private or sectional interest will be furthered to the detriment of the common good of all.

Inspire, we beseech Thee, each and every member of our Government with particular devotion to the welfare of those segments of our population most in need of protection; but never let governmental aid degenerate into the preservation of special privilege or result in the loss of true freedom, initiative, and

responsibility in our citizens; help the makers and executors of our laws to discern and follow the thin line of demarcation between expedient action based on no firm principles and that art of political realism which accepts the immediate partial achievement of ideal goals without the sacrifice of principle.

Extend, finally, Thy sympathetic consolation to these, our political representatives, when the endeavor to follow conscience produces misunderstanding, abuse, or even outright misrepresentation; remind them of Thy promise of a general judgment when the light of Thy justice will read all hearts, when all things will be set right, and Thy justice will say to all who have followed it: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter into thy reward." Amen.